

July 20, 1965

THE OTEPKA CASE—WILLIAM WIELAND DISPATCHED TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the State Department, according to press reports, is dispatching William Wieland to Australia as supervisory consul general in Canberra.

This assignment makes Wieland the top consular officer in Australia.

Such an announcement normally is treated with a bare mention in the press and seldom is noted on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

This assignment merits more than the usual treatment because the official in question is one of the central figures in the controversy over security policies and practices in the State Department itself.

In the New York Times of Monday, July 19, this paragraph appears:

According to a State Department spokesman today, Mr. Wieland is now considered "completely cleared and his case closed."

While the State Department has closed the case, I, for one, do not intend to dismiss so lightly what has occurred previously in this matter.

Perhaps there should be a review of what has gone on before in this case and to question whether the surface reason for closing the case by the State Department is good enough.

Wieland was chief of the Office of Caribbean Affairs of the State Department when Castro grabbed power in Cuba.

Based on testimony of the Department's chief security evaluator, Otto Otepka—now being persecuted by the Department for daring to testify before a Senate committee—Wieland had lied about his contacts with Castro.

Otepka stated that there is a transcript of the Wieland testimony which shows that Wieland said he had only one meeting with Castro. Otepka says he has evidence that Wieland met with Castro on at least six occasions.

Wieland failed to list his former name of William Arthur Montenegro on his government forms. The Senate Internal Security Committee questioned Wieland on this omission and the transcript was subsequently sent to the Justice Department for study for possible perjury prosecution.

The Justice Department reported, according to documents, that there was insufficient evidence for a perjury prosecution. And this report apparently is the basis for restoration of Wieland to active duty assignments abroad, even though he held down a \$24,000 annual job in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration during the interval.

But is this report by the Justice Department sufficient grounds for giving Wieland a clear bill of health? I think not.

What about the misrepresentations involving meetings with Castro? There appears to be ample evidence that Wieland, as chief of the Caribbean desk, "sat on" reports which showed that Castro was a Communist, while the entire world was led to believe that he was otherwise; that he was a "patriot" of the first order.

What was Wieland's excuse for not listing his former name on the Government forms?

Why has Otepka been beset with continued harassment for his testimony before the Senate committee?

What was in the report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to force a stay of assignment of Wieland to a sensitive post in West Germany?

These are questions that must be answered; if they are not, the security measures of the State Department will remain suspect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "U.S. Expert on Cuba Restored to Full Duty Following Inquiry," written by Richard Eder, and published in the New York Times of July 19, 1965; an article entitled "Board Clears Wieland, Security Case Closed," written by Endre Marton, and published in the Washington Post of July 19, 1965; and the lead editorial entitled "The State Department Security Scandal," published in the Chicago Tribune of July 19, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1965]

U.S. EXPERT ON CUBA RESTORED TO FULL DUTY FOLLOWING INQUIRY—STATE DEPARTMENT ADVISORY PANEL UPHOLDS WIELAND'S JUDGMENTS ON CASTRO

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—William A. Wieland, a State Department officer who came under congressional attack for his role in shaping United States policy on Cuba in the early days of the Castro regime, has been cleared and restored to full active duty, according to a Department announcement.

Mr. Wieland, a high-ranking 57-year-old career officer, will go to Santerra as supervisory consul general for Australia.

The Department's announcement, made to coincide with the publication of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on Mr. Wieland, disclosed by implication that he had been placed on what amounted to limited duty during an inter-agency review of his record.

A three-man advisory panel was appointed by the State Department in 1965 to consider Mr. Wieland's case. After reviewing the Department's own records and information supplied by other agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the panel, two of whose members were from outside the Department, recommended that "the subject be restored to full status as an active senior Foreign Service officer."

JUDGMENT IS UPHELD

Mr. Wieland, the board reported, "has honestly exercised his judgment over the years, including the period of the difficult and highly complex Cuban situation."

State Department officials said that at no time had Mr. Wieland been suspended during the investigation. A spokesman was unable to define what lesser degree of status was involved in the panel's recommendation that he be "restored" to full status.

One official source pointed out, however, that Mr. Wieland's most recent assignment—as an administrative specialist in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration—was considered an unobstructive job for someone of his experience.

The Senate subcommittee, in a report made in 1962, said that Mr. Wieland, who held posts concerned with Caribbean policy before and during the first years of Premier

Fidel Castro's government was in part responsible for Mr. Castro's emergence.

In testimony, three former U.S. Ambassadors in Latin America—Robert C. Hill, Earl E. T. Smith, and William D. Pawley—criticized Mr. Wieland for recommending the withdrawal of American support from President Fulgencio Batista, who exercised dictatorial powers in Cuba in the late 1950's.

Mr. Wieland testified that he had begun to distrust Mr. Castro even before the latter took power, but that he was not convinced of the Premier's direct Communist connections until some months afterwards.

Early in 1962, Mr. Wieland was one of two State Department officers whom President Kennedy defended when they were called security risks.

In 1961, Mr. Wieland was assigned to a consular post in Germany but his security clearance was delayed and the assignment was finally withdrawn.

According to a State Department spokesman today, Mr. Wieland is now considered "completely cleared and his case closed." This action was taken, although not announced, in January, when the State Department's review panel approved the findings of the three-man advisory panel.

The members of the panel were William J. Sebald, former Ambassador to Burma; Samuel Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Brig. Gen. Milton F. Summersett, retired.

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1965]

BOARD CLEARS WIELAND, SECURITY CASE CLOSED
(By Endre Marton)

William A. Wieland, the American diplomat blamed by some critics for initial U.S. good will toward Fidel Castro, has been cleared fully and his security case closed, a Senate publication revealed last night.

The publication, containing transcripts of secret testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee between 1963 and 1965, bears the title "The Wieland Case Updated." It is the first of a reported 30 volumes on hearings held in these years on State Department security.

The volume, however, contains little added detail on the Wieland case, which was extensively discussed in an earlier volume released in 1962 when Wieland was first cleared.

There is much more in the present publication on the role played in the Wieland investigation by Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's chief security evaluator who, though fired in 1963 on charges of insubordination, still is on the State Department's payroll.

SECRET TESTIMONY

The fact that Wieland, head of the State Department's Office of Caribbean Affairs when Castro grabbed power in Cuba, had been cleared again was revealed by William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, in secret testimony before the subcommittee May 4, 1965.

The decision by a three-man board to close finally the once-reopened security case against the 57-year-old Wieland was made in concurrence with the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a special personnel advisory board, and the then Attorney General, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Crockett testified.

The Deputy Under Secretary told the subcommittee the first favorable determination in the Wieland case, in January 1962, was signed by Otepka, even though he told the subcommittee 18 months later, in August 1963, that he questioned Wieland's "judgment and integrity."

Otepka was suspended in September 1963, and charged with conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State" for allegedly having made classified documents available to the Senate subcommittee with-

July 20, 1965

16844

out authorization. He was dismissed from the Service November 5, 1963.

Otepka has appealed the dismissal. His counsel, Roger Robb, has asked on five occasions for postponements of the hearing which have been granted. The reason Robb gave was that he wanted to study the transcript of the subcommittee hearings, the first of which is the volume on Wieland.

INQUIRY ORDERED

Most of the witnesses were questioned by subcommittee counsel, J. G. Sourwine, to find out why Otepka took no part in the second phase of the Wieland investigation in 1963. This investigation was ordered after the subcommittee accused Wieland of being "an active apologist for Fidel Castro," and a man who, in Sourwine's words, "lied to this committee."

"An evaluation of all the new material was made No reason was found to remove Mr. Wieland's clearance," Crockett told the subcommittee in his May 4 testimony.

There were two conflicting versions of why Otepka did not participate in the reevaluation of Wieland.

According to John F. Reilly's testimony—he was then head of the Office of Security and as such Otepka's superior—Otepka disqualified himself voluntarily from handling the reevaluation on the ground that he had testified before the subcommittee.

Otepka, on the other hand, said his superiors first wanted him to handle the Wieland case, then abolished his job as Deputy Director of his office on the grounds that Otepka was devoting too much time to personnel security cases.

DENIES PREJUDICES

Therefore, Otepka said, "and not because of presumed prejudices against Wieland," he did not wish to become again the principal evaluator of the Wieland case.

The board that reviewed the case of Wieland was unanimous in its recommendation for Wieland's restoration to full status as an active senior Foreign Service officer.

The board, in its finding, said its members were puzzled, individually and collectively, as to why Wieland was singled out as a scapegoat for the Castro takeover.

Wieland is currently an administrative specialist at the State Department. Now that his case is closed, he is being assigned as supervisory consul general in Canberra, Australia—a position making him the top consular officer in Australia.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 20, 1965]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY SCANDAL

After 3 years of hearings and a million and a half words of testimony and documentation, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released the first installment of its account of how Otto F. Otepka was fired as Chief of the Evaluations Division of the State Department's Office of Security.

It is almost unbelievable that so much time and effort had to be devoted to what is essentially a simple case. But the facts as they emerge will, we are certain, have a profound impact on the American public. For this is a story of high-level intrigue, of deceit and evasion by the people's servants in high places, and of shameful retaliation against an honorable man simply because he told the truth to a committee of Congress, as by law he was required to do.

As Chief of Evaluations, Otepka's job was to separate the wrong guys from the right ones seeking employment and assignment to the Department. He was charged with informing his superiors whether an applicant or an existing employee was a loyalty or security risk. He did so conscientiously, but his findings were ignored. The wrong guys were posted to handle the sensitive diplomacy of the United States, while the right

guy—Mr. Otepka—found himself out of a job.

He had the right to appeal his dismissal, and did, but for close to 2 years the State Department has refused to give him a hearing. So he remains on the payroll, collects his salary, but is confined to a cubbyhole, in effect cutting up paper dolls. For his patriotism and his adherence to truth, he is ostracized by the brass and rankers of the Department, who operate on the code that loyalty to the Department comes before loyalty to the country.

Secretary of State Rusk and his bureaucracy can't afford to give Mr. Otepka his hearing, for to do so would expose the curious values that prevail in the Department, where men of dubious reliability are to be protected, as "members of the club," at all costs.

Otepka fell into disfavor after he was summoned by the subcommittee to assist in a study it had undertaken of security practices in the Department. He testified about "quickie" clearances designed to bypass security rules. One of the Department officials attracting the notice of the Senators was William A. Wieland, a Foreign Service officer of the first class, who has been paid \$20,000 a year but has just been appointed chief American consular officer in Australia, at a salary advance of another \$4,000.

It developed that Wieland had once lived in Cuba under the name of Montenegro, but concealed the fact in his job application, which exposed him to prosecution for perjury. In his testimony before the subcommittee, he admitted having seen Fidel Castro only once, but Otepka testified to six meetings. Wieland was a consistent apologist for Castro while presiding over the State Department's Caribbean desk.

His appointment to that post shocked William D. Pawley, former Ambassador to Brazil, under whom Wieland had served. By cutting off the supply of arms to Cuba, Wieland helped bring about the downfall of the Fulgencio Batista government and assisted the rise of Castro. Every intelligence report demonstrating that Castro was, and always had been, a Communist was disregarded, denounced, or sidetracked by Wieland. Robert C. Hill, a former Ambassador, told the Senators that Wieland was either "a damn fool or a Communist."

The subcommittee's first report deals with the Wieland case. Yet this man enjoys favor in the State Department and has been publicly defended by no less august a person than the late President Kennedy, while Otepka and his security staff have been rendered impotent and have been disgracefully hounded out of their protective office. It is an all but incredible story, but it is true. How long will the people tolerate these betrayals?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Yesterday the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security was made available. I took the time last night to read the report from start to finish. I recommend to all Senators a reading of the report. If Senators will read the report of the actual hearings and findings, as I did, and place them side by side with the report of the statement issued by the Department of State, they will find that they do not appear to be referring to the same situation.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for bringing this information to the attention of the Senate. I recommend that further scrutiny be made of this question because of the tensions of the world today. Now, more than ever, questions not only of security, but of international

operations, are becoming more and more essential.

The President, in making his determinations, must depend on reports, including those which are issued by officers such as the gentleman who is in question today. We must be more certain than ever before as to the qualifications, reliability, and other attributes of men of this character.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from California for his gracious remarks. I commend him for reading the report. I have not had the opportunity to read all of the report; but I have read enough to warrant the statements that I have made. I hope that not only will Members of the Senate read it, but that members of the State Department in high posts will read it, too.

UNDERSTANDING THE VIETNAM PROBLEM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star on July 19, 1965, published an excellent article entitled "The 1954 Parley Led to Vietnam Crisis," written by the distinguished columnist David Lawrence. The article is based on Mr. Lawrence's personal observations during the 1954 Geneva conversations, which led to the Geneva agreements, which have been referred to so often during the running debate on our position in Vietnam.

Because I believe it would be a valuable article to read as background for an understanding of why we are engaged as we are in Vietnam today, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1954 PARLEY LED TO VIETNAM CRISIS (By David Lawrence)

To understand the Vietnam problem and the great danger that the world faces if appeasement and surrender should take the place of firmness and courage, it is only necessary to go back 11 years to the historic Conference at Geneva in 1954 and examine the mistakes that were made then which have led to the crisis of today.

For the Vietnam dilemma is not just a local affair in far-off Asia. It is the most vital and fundamental confrontation between Communist imperialism and the free world which has developed since the Korean war of 1950.

The American people have not yet been awakened to the implications of the Vietnam struggle. There's a tendency to pass it off as something that will be compromised sooner or later or as a conflict from which America should gracefully withdraw.

The same kind of pressures from the appeasers and the defeatists managed to weaken the will of France and Britain at the Geneva Conference in 1954, so that in the end the United States disassociated itself from the agreement reached because it was clear that no strong foundation for peace in southeast Asia had been laid.

This correspondent spent several weeks covering the Conference at Geneva and wrote daily dispatches about it. Here are some excerpts which indicate clearly that the world

hasn't learned its lesson and why aggressors are still undismayed:

May 13, 1954: "As to Indochina, there will be a patched-up proposal to bring about a cessation of hostilities, but the United States will not be satisfied with the plan because of a fear that the Communists will be able thereby to overrun all of Indochina. Accordingly, as was announced in the early days of this Conference by Secretary of State Dulles, the American Government will 'disassociate' itself from the proposal."

May 30: "For what good will it do to withdraw all French protection from the newly created states of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam if Moscow-trained leaders like Ho Chi Minh are in charge of the Government of Vietnam and of its armies, with substantial aid from Red China, continue to overrun the neighboring states and threaten also Burma and Thailand, whose borders are nearby?"

June 14: "The world is witnessing the dangerous consequences of allied disunity. The American Government is an interested but helpless bystander. For American public opinion would not sanction military intervention in Indochina except on an allied basis, and the French have never been ready formally to ask for it. Hence the free world allows the advantage once more to go to the Communists, who are thereby encouraged to encroach further and further. This hastens the day of a showdown which, if it comes too late, may make it impossible to stop the sweep of Communist imperialism throughout Asia."

July 20: "The Indochina truce, like the Korean armistice, is not a victory, but a readiness to compromise with aggressors and to sanction their continued hold on many million more people who are to become enslaved."

"Plainly the trend in Europe on the part of America's allies is toward further surrender to Communist imperialism."

Back in 1954, while the Geneva Conference was going on, the Democrats in Congress, including then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, were sniping at the Eisenhower administration and accusing it of being a "warmongering" regime. The political disunity in this country had its effect abroad. Inside the British Government the Socialist Labor groups were taking an extreme position and preventing Britain from giving wholehearted support to the United States in its effort to form a truly effective southeast Asia organization.

The politicians somehow have not changed their attitude, and today there are Republicans as well as Democrats here who are making it more difficult for the incumbent administration to convince the Communists that the United States is not going to surrender and will not withdraw its military forces, but will insist upon driving the Communists out of South Vietnam.

It's certainly a critical time in American history and far more dangerous than the average man has been led to believe. The United States has its hands full in trying to fight the southeast Asia war alone. It needs the help of its allies—assistance not only in money but in manpower and particularly by an agreement to embargo all commerce with the Communist countries now supplying aid to North Vietnam.

Such action now can prevent world war III, which otherwise might come through step-by-step escalation set in motion by the same kind of appeasement, pacifism and timidity that led to World War II.

TAX CUTS AND TAX INCREASES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the July 19 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains two very timely articles. Both have as their base the Senate's recent action on the so-called medicare bill.

One bluntly states:

Despite all the tax-cut talk, bigger and bigger bills lie ahead for the vast majority of taxpayers.

It underscores that some of the effects of last year's income tax cut will be wiped out by raising social security taxes, effective next January 1. While it does not say so in so many words, this is the age-old policy of giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

In an accompanying table, the magazine shows the impact of new taxes on a married man with two children. For those with an income of \$5,000, the tax increase from this year to the next year will be 9.5 percent.

Editor David Lawrence, in the same issue, makes this observation:

Now, with an increase in Social Security taxes about to be imposed, there will be a reduction in take-home pay for the wage earner, starting next January. Under the Senate bill, factory workers getting between \$4,800 and \$6,600 a year will have their payments for social security taxes raised from \$174 to sums ranging up to \$275. This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

To those who believe they are getting something for nothing, let me repeat the last sentence:

This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

This accurately sums up some of my arguments against the bill passed last week: The medicare bill will weigh most heavily on those least able to afford such increases.

Mr. Lawrence also points up another argument I made last week:

The American people could have paid for 'medicare' out of the general revenues, and the social security tax could have been kept somewhere near the low rates originally planned. But this would have made it necessary for the Government to economize. Too much public money is being spent nowadays for what might be called luxuries—they are not necessities. * * * Inefficiency and waste in expenditures are greater than ever before.

I ask unanimous consent that article entitled "With All the Talk About a Tax Cut," with the accompanying table entitled "Tax on Married Man With Two Children," and the editorial "Reducing Take-Home Pay," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article, table, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH ALL THE TALK ABOUT A TAX CUT

In Arizona, taxpayers are being hit with a 30-percent jump in the State income tax, a rise of 4½ cents a pack in cigarette taxes, and a boost in the gasoline levy by 1 cent per gallon.

That's typical of a process going on in many States across the Nation: Recent Federal tax cuts are being eaten up by steadily rising State, city and county levies.

The Federal Government itself soon is to wipe out some of the effects of last year's income tax cut by raising social security taxes, effective next January 1.

The upshot: The total tax bite for Americans is going up again after a brief downturn.

The rise that lies ahead will center in State and local taxes and in payroll taxes to support social security programs.

The payroll tax now is 3.625 percent each for employer and employee on the first \$4,800 of an individual's income. On January 1, under a Senate plan, it will rise to 4.175 percent on the first \$6,600 of earnings.

The tax on the individual and his employer thus will rise from the present maximum of \$174 each to \$275.55 each next year.

WHAT CONGRESS IS DOING

The Senate on July 9 approved the payroll tax increase. The House has already approved a somewhat smaller boost as part of a package that will include "medicare" for aged persons and an increase in social security benefits.

If experience is a guide, both the health-care and social security programs will continue to expand, in coverage and cost, during the years ahead—and payroll taxes will rise much above the levels now projected.

The accompanying chart gives you some idea of the heavier tax impact due next January 1. It reflects the anticipated boosts in the payroll tax for social security, on the basis of the increases that were approved by the Senate on July 9, and the boosts expected in the major taxes that are levied by the States.

On a percentage basis, the impact will be greatest on individuals with incomes of \$10,000 or less, although it will also be substantial on those earning higher incomes.

In a typical example, a married man with 2 children and \$3,000 of annual income can expect his State and Federal tax bill on 1966 income to climb by \$17 above this year, or 15 percent.

At the \$4,000 level, a boost of \$26 is in store next year, while the family man making \$10,000 faces an increase of \$160, or nearly 11 percent.

In the case of a single man earning \$2,500, a tax boost of \$28 is in prospect—more than half a week's wage.

Not counted in these figures are a raft of other State and local taxes, including certain sales taxes, real estate levies and auto-license fees. Such taxes are scheduled to go up in many States. Thus many taxpayers across the country face even stiffer hikes in tax bills than shown in the table.

It will take some time, in the case of many individuals, before rising State and local taxes and higher social security levies exceed the recent reductions in Federal income taxes. Yet the trend is clear:

Despite all the tax-cut talk, bigger and bigger bills lie ahead for the vast majority of taxpayers.

Tax on married man with 2 children¹

Total income per year	1965	1966	Change
\$5,000.....	\$503	\$551	Up \$48, or 9.5 percent.
\$10,000.....	1,462	1,622	Up \$160, or 10.9 percent.
\$15,000.....	2,545	2,760	Up \$205, or 8 percent.
\$20,000.....	5,165	5,460	Up \$295, or 5.7 percent.
\$50,000.....	14,766	15,286	Up \$520, or 3.5 percent.
\$100,000.....	40,526	41,496	Up \$970, or 2.4 percent.

¹ Not included in these figures are sales taxes, real estate taxes, and auto license fees. Such levies are rising in many States, will boost total tax bills still higher in months ahead.

NOTE.—Figures for 1966 are based on social security bill as approved by the Senate.

Source: U.S. News & World Report Economic Unit.

REDUCING TAKE-HOME PAY

(By David Lawrence)

Most workers, when asked how much they are earning, cannot, as a rule, remember exactly the total sum—they think only in terms of take-home pay. What is deducted by the employer from wages or salary for payment of the worker's taxes is not usually considered a part of income. Labor unions, for example, base their calculations on what the wage earner actually takes home.

Now, with an increase in social security taxes about to be imposed, there will be a reduction in take-home pay for the wage earner, starting next January. Under the Senate bill, factory workers getting between \$4,800 and \$6,600 a year will have their payments for social security taxes raised from \$174 to sums ranging up to \$275. This means an increase of from 15 to 58 percent of their current social security tax.

The Government also requires employers to match the amounts paid by the employees, so that next year approximately \$5 billion more will be collected in social security taxes. This amount is to increase steadily, and in 7 years will go up by \$17.4 billion.

What does all this mean to the economy of the Nation? What effect will it have on labor-union demands for increased incomes for the workers? What will be the impact on the price structure?

All these questions need to be examined because anything which is going to affect the national economy so intensively is bound to have some influence on business conditions as a whole and particularly on the capacity of the United States to compete in certain foreign markets. For undoubtedly prices in this country will have to rise to take care of the increased costs.

Theoretically, the Federal Government has reduced the tax burden by cutting income-tax rates and by eliminating some of the excise taxes. But, at the same time, the increases in taxes levied for social security will tend to offset some of the benefits allegedly to be derived from the tax-reduction policies of the last 2 years.

Certainly the labor unions are not going to overlook the fact that take-home pay will be reduced. Demands for higher wages are inevitable.

But, even though the individual worker may be convinced that "medicare" is eventually for his own benefit and for that of older members of his family whom he might otherwise be compelled to care for out of his wages, the fact remains that the labor unions will feel it their duty to obtain as quickly as possible increases in wages to offset the drop in take-home pay resulting from larger payroll deductions for social security.

Was there some other way to take care of the medical problems of the elderly? Unquestionably it could have been done and benefits given not only to the needy but to all the aged if the Government had decided to pay for medical care out of its general receipts. Persons with large incomes now are paying higher rates than those with low incomes. There certainly is no reason why the

principle of the graduated income tax shouldn't continue to apply, instead of using a system of special taxes.

For it is a hardship to impose what is really a double tax on income. Many citizens who have been led to believe they benefit from being in a low income-tax bracket will discover that there are no tax deductions or exemptions when it comes to paying social security taxes. Some portion of social security benefits certainly should be paid for out of wages. But the whole system now has been extended so much that in the not-far-distant future employers and employees together will be paying for social security about 11 percent of all wages up to \$6,600 a year. This is entirely apart from deductions made by the withholding of income taxes under the so-called pay-as-you-go plan.

The American people could have paid for "medicare" out of the general revenues, and the social security tax could have been kept somewhere near the low rates originally planned. But this would have made it necessary for the Government to economize. Too much public money is being spent nowadays for what might be called luxuries—they are not necessities. The pressure by the politicians to get pork barrel appropriations continues. Inefficiency and waste in expenditures are greater than ever before.

A prudent system of managing the Nation's finances would have provided all of the benefits that now are to be given for the medical care of the aged and for retirement incomes for the workers. But a double system of taxation is bound to increase the hardships of many millions of wage earners who really cannot afford to have their take-home pay reduced.

Sooner or later, the Federal Government must adopt sound fiscal policies and insist upon efficiency and economy in the expenditure of public funds. Otherwise, as the Treasury deficits continue year after year, the value of the dollar will continue to decline and America will feel the full effects of the dreaded inflation which, throughout history, has ruined the financial structure of many a nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic

research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1217. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 1314. An act for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth;

H.R. 1374. An act for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer;

H.R. 1487. An act for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 2881. An act for the relief of George A. Grabert;

H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Alfred Estrada; and

H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20, 1965:

U.N. AMBASSADOR

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

July 20, 1965

A3927

secure reasonable rate levels was recognized by the Inter-agency Committee on International Air Policy. They recommended to the President that our national air policy favor continuation of charter competition by supplemental carriers in order to assure pressure on the fare structure and a yardstick as to the economics of air transportation.

Interestingly enough, the group faced the question of what policy should be followed when international air fares were reduced. The answer was not then to curtail charter activity by these carriers—but to expand their competitive opportunity. The purpose here was to assure that these carriers remained economically viable in the market so that their withdrawal would not precipitate a return to a high-fare policy over the Atlantic by IATA.

This leads me to certain recent developments in charter policy. As you will recall, IATA in 1962 initiated group fares in the transatlantic area. It was clear that this was a competitive response to the charter program. Although the Civil Aeronautics Board had specifically sought this objective, it did not react to its attainment, with a tightening up of its transatlantic charter standards. On the contrary, it liberalized them. Thus, part 295 was modified to eliminate the 20,000-member limit on size of groups eligible for charter. IATA has, of course, retained this limit except for universities and employee groups. Part 295 was also revised to allow a travel agent better to assist in a group's charter organizing activities. However, IATA did not follow our lead; in fact, it maintained as requirements in resolution 045 restrictions abandoned by the Board. The Board also, in granting to Capitol and Saturn 5-year certificates of public convenience and necessity for transatlantic charter service, authorized these carriers to provide split charters.

Moreover, there is still pending before the Board the question of whether Capitol and Saturn should be authorized to provide charters to travel agents for the sale by such agents of all-expense tours for nonaffinity groups.

In just the last few weeks the Board has confirmed the grant of temporary operating authority for transpacific affinity charters for World Airways and Trans International Airlines. In taking this action, the Board specifically called attention to its hope that a charter program would be as successful in the Pacific as it was in the Atlantic in stimulating fare reductions.

The Board has also proposed to broaden the definition of charters to be performed by supplemental carriers in the domestic market to include charters to travel agents for the provision of all-expense tours for nonaffinity groups. In proposing this expanded charter authority, the Board has been mindful of the need of the supplemental air carriers for an increased opportunity for commercial business. However, even more significantly, in my judgment, has been its awareness of the fact that the all-expense tour approach opens the possibility of a greatly expanded recreation travel market.

In this connection, we must take note of European experience. Thus, we are told that in 10 years time all-expense tour traffic between Scandinavia and the Mediterranean increased from 10,000 to 400,000 passengers annually, while individually ticketed travel continued to grow at about 15 percent per year.

It is clear that domestic all-expense tour charters can, by making the "See America First" program a better travel bargain, contribute in a constructive way to our President's efforts to solve the gold-flow problem.

Of course, one must not get the impression that the Board's sole concern in regulating air transportation is to reduce fares or to assure the economic health of the supplemental air carriers. It is not. A primary

objective of the Board must be, and is to assure the continued economic well-being of the basic industry—the trunk carriers, the U.S.-flag carriers, the cargo carriers, and the local service industry. Without economic viability these carriers would be unable to discharge effectively the heavy burden of public service imposed upon them. They would be unable to make the equipment and service innovations that we have come to expect of them. Nor would they be able to sustain and expand the superb air service network which makes our country the envy of every other nation.

Its concern in this regard leads the Board to so regulate the charter program as to limit its potential diversion from the individually-ticketed service provided over our basic system. This then is the reason for the specific rules which have developed over the years for transatlantic charter service, and which are applied administratively in other international areas when our approval is sought.

On the other hand, the domestic charter program has had a different evolution. Historically, there has been no requirement for prior administrative approval of domestic charters by licensed carriers. Nor has there been until recently any significant volume of domestic charter traffic by supplemental air carriers.

Under these circumstances, it had been possible to permit these charters to be conducted without specific delineation of the applicable rules. As many of you know, until recently, practically the only firm prohibition was against the direct charter to a travel agent or for the solicitation of the general public. But in 1963, there arose for the first time a need on the part of certain supplemental carriers to develop domestic charter business. At the same time, relatively high fares in certain significant recreational travel market provided an economic incentive for hotel operators and travel agents to utilize charter travel as a competitive and promotional vehicle. The service, initiated in 1963, expanded greatly in 1964. As it did, the situation deteriorated rapidly. As a result, the Board promptly took action to stop the advertising of individual charters in mass media as a key factor in what appeared to be widespread evasion of the basic charter prohibition—sale of charters to the general public.

Almost concurrently, a local Federal court in Boston, without opposition from the Board, granted almost unprecedented temporary injunctions which effectively stopped all charter operations to Miami and Honolulu for three of the largest supplemental carriers.

We are hopeful that, as a result of these developments, any slide toward wholesale departure from sound organization rules for affinity charters will have been contained.

We now look forward to the termination of the Supplemental Air Carrier Case, Docket 13795, in which there is pending both the question of the carriers to receive permanent charter authority and the nature of that authority.

The staff objective in that case is to obtain a consistent definition of affinity charters which could be applied with little, if any, distinction for charters to be conducted from New York to Tokyo or Paris, as well as from Chicago to Las Vegas. Within that objective we intend to recommend the establishment of charter rules which will, insofar as possible, protect the basic transportation system from undue diversion without unduly complicating the organization of a charter by legitimate groups.

Since there is a measure of contradiction in these objectives, I am almost positive that if we do our job well no single group will be completely satisfied.

Let me now turn to some predictions for the future.

That affinity charters will continue, and that this market domestically and interna-

tionally will show strong growth among large industrial organizations, universities, and fraternal groups;

That all-expense tours will tap new markets, including, but not limited to people in smaller business concerns, colleges, fraternal groups, and honest nonjoiners who were not before able readily to organize a charter;

That the scheduled carriers will compete effectively in the expanded market for personal and recreational travel with lower no-frill service, new promotional fares, and increased incentive-type agency commissions;

That with greater leisure time in an affluent society the public will benefit from an enhanced opportunity to travel quickly, comfortably, and safely by air to more and more distant and attractive destinations.

Coinage Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8926) to provide for the coinage of the United States.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of H.R. 8926, the Coinage Act of 1965.

As you know, President Johnson has strongly recommended prompt congressional action on this legislation to prevent a crisis in our silver supply. In his message of June 3, 1965, he stated categorically that "Silver is becoming too scarce for continued large-scale use in coins."

I agree with the President that the worldwide shortage of silver, together with rapidly increasing consumption of that metal for defense, industrial, and coinage purposes, have created an emergency situation which necessitates the first important change in the Nation's coinage since 1792—a substantial reduction in the silver content of the denominations of U.S. coins—dimes, quarters, and 50-cent pieces—now using silver as a major alloy ingredient.

Since 1958 alone, world demand for silver has more than doubled, while production has increased less than 15 percent. As a result, Treasury Department authorities predict at the present rate of silver consumption in the United States, chiefly for coinage, this Nation will run out of silver within 2 or 3 years.

However, Mr. Speaker, I also believe it is important to our national prestige and to continued world confidence in the essential soundness of our currency system to retain a certain basic minimum silver content in all our major coins.

For this reason, I voted to support the amendment just offered to provide that quarters and dimes retain a silver content of 40 percent, thus maintaining the principle of a coinage system with actual intrinsic value.

Although I regret that this amendment failed to secure a majority vote of the Members, I nevertheless, feel the urgency of the legislation requires that we now join in support of the President in his ef-

A3928

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 20, 1965

fort to adapt our Nation's coinage to meet the needs and demands of modern conditions.

Under the bill as it now stands, the silver content of half dollars will be reduced from 90 to 40 percent, and silver will be eliminated entirely from dimes and quarters.

This drastically reduced use of silver in our coinage will, according to expert testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, offer a permanent solution to our silver crisis, and provide the basis for carrying out the President's recommendation to change our coinage system "to meet new and growing needs."

The new dimes and quarters will have a solid copper cores, with "sandwich" covers of cupronickel. So these smaller coins will have the same kind of face material as the present 5-cent piece, with the copper core visible as a reddish line on their rims. The new half dollar, containing 40 percent silver, would look about the same.

All the new coins would be similar in design to the present coins of the same denominations. They will be legal tender for all debts, public and private. The Secretary of the Treasury has assured us he is confident they will meet the test of public acceptability as a medium of exchange, that they can be efficiently and rapidly manufactured by the mints from available materials—in fact, the Bureau of the Mint plans to turn out 3.5 billion coins in the first year, and double this production in the year thereafter—and that their size, weight, and electrical properties make them fully compatible with silver coins and able to work in all existing vending machines and other coin-operated devices.

Another commendable feature of this bill is its authorization for the San Francisco Assay Office, which was deactivated as a mint in 1955 after more than 100 years of continuous operation at a time when coin demand was only a fraction of present needs, to continue its gold and silver refining operation and also to reactivate its coin-production facilities until such time as the Secretary determines that the mints of the United States are adequate to produce ample supplies of coins.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the President has now proposed reactivating the historic century-old San Francisco Mint to help ease the transition to the new coinage system, and as a significant step toward alleviating the increasingly critical coin shortage that has been plaguing businessmen and individuals across the country.

With all other U.S. mints presently working on a full-time 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week basis, reopening the additional San Francisco minting facility will be a big help during the transition period, and will be the quickest, cheapest, and most efficient way of expanding the inadequate supply of small change now in circulation.

I have a rather personal interest in the President's plan to reactivate coin production at San Francisco, because it follows my nearly identical proposal of a year ago, made in an effort to again pro-

vide a west coast mint to supplement those now located at Philadelphia and Denver.

We in Los Angeles, as well as citizens throughout the State of California, have a vital stake in this matter. As residents of the Nation's fastest growing metropolitan area, and what is now the largest State in the Union, we have already felt the adverse effects of the current acute shortage of coins.

In fact, the situation has become so serious that many local Los Angeles retailers and merchants are reporting considerable difficulty in keeping an adequate supply of change on hand to operate their businesses properly and provide the kind of service their customers have a right to expect.

If the Treasury Department's Bureau of the Mint now moves on a crash-program basis, and fully utilizes the minting capacity of the San Francisco facility, we should be able to make a successful transition to the new coinage system, and at the same time, be assured of the pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars so essential to the smooth functioning of our booming commercial economy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me again urge the Members of the House to join in support of the President by voting for the passage of H.R. 8926, the Coinage Act of 1965.

Fe. [Signature]
**One-Track Minds Try To Railroad Us
Out of Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Savannah News recently carried an editorial entitled "One-Track Minds" which brought in lucid fashion that those who have repeatedly opposed U.S. involvement in Vietnam have put forward no practical solution to the Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

The Savannah News editorial voices unequivocal support for the President's taking a stand in Vietnam, and I include the editorial of July 3 in the Record at this point:

ONE-TRACK MINDS

Have you noticed how most of the protesters of our involvement in the fight to keep South Vietnam free come up with only one proposal—"Get out of Vietnam."

Where are their alternatives? Where are their solutions to how communism can be stopped from new aggression? How do they propose to halt this evil force if a stand isn't taken somewhere? Do they suggest that the best policy of the United States would be to let the entire world—except our own Nation—fall into Communist hands and then let blood and destruction befall our own shores at a last ditch stand?

If the United States were to adhere to the wishes of the "get out" boys, it might someday watch the same protesters picket the White House with signs of "Get out of the United States."

We are mighty wary of the motivation be-

hind those protesters who offer only one suggestion—surrender. This is the line communism suggests.

President Johnson is right in taking a stand and committing the United States to help keep South Vietnam free.

**"Lingo Tech"—The Defense Language
Institute at Monterey, Calif.**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important institutions of the Department of Defense is the Army Language School at Monterey, Calif., technically the Defense Language Institute West Coast Branch, DLIWCB, or "Lingo Tech."

If our military is to be truly a "profession of peace," our soldiers must be able, at least, to speak the language of our allies and friends. Great advantage would accrue if our militarists, and ambassadors, could speak the language of our adversaries and enemies.

A first step toward better world understanding is better oral communication.

Soldiers who have a second language are "twice armed." Guns may be necessary, but language—"their language"—could be a superior weapon.

Our future military and diplomatic personnel will be required more and more to be fluent in foreign language.

The Army language school has developed the best methods of teaching foreign language yet devised. Many schools and universities are utilizing DLI techniques.

The DLI and its techniques should be enlarged on a crash basis. Every agency of the Government which deals with any foreign person should develop a high foreign language proficiency.

The Time magazine article tells part of the story, briefly:

LEARNING—LINGO TECH

In the jungle battlefields of Vietnam, knowing the Vietnamese language may be as important to a U.S. soldier as his accuracy in firing an M-14. Supplying American military advisers there with the right words is fast becoming the primary mission of what its graduates call "Lingo Tech": the west coast branch of the Defense Language Institute, located at the Army's historic Presidio in Monterey, Calif.

Operated for all the services by the Army Department, the institute had its modest beginnings in 1941 as an Army intelligence course in Japanese, now have five schools across the country. Of these, the oldest and by far the largest is the branch at Monterey, which trains up to 2,500 military personnel a year in 27 languages and 33 dialects, in courses that range from a 12-week quickie in Vietnamese to a full 47 weeks in Chinese, Russian, Arabic and some 13 other languages.

DON'T DROP A PENCIL

The language training at Monterey is the most intense in the United States, and students joke: "If you drop a pencil in class and take time to pick it up, you've lost an hour's material." Classes run for 6 hours a day, 5

food price increases directly attributable to present administration policies.

Several people who reside in the District of Columbia have written to me advising that food prices in June actually were even higher than those quoted in the U.S. News & World Report article. A typical letter from a sincere, concerned lady appears at the end of my remarks. She also might write to Labor Secretary Wirtz, Agriculture Secretary Freeman, and the President.

The full text of the letter, with name of sender omitted, follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

July 16, 1965.

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT, OF CALIFORNIA,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1965, vol. 111, No. 115, pages A3345 and A3346 on "Higher Prices of Food Hurt the Poor Most of All."

The little chart which compared May and June food prices was a comparison chart in its own way, but—the prices that I have seen in one major chainstore in Washington, D.C. is way above the prices in the chart, i.e.:

Sirloin steak (pound)-----	\$1.39
Sirloin tip (pound)-----	1.39
Porterhouse steak (pound)-----	1.39
Chuck roast (pound)-----	.69
Ground round (pound)-----	.89
Pork chops (pound)-----	1.09
Bacon (pound)-----	.95
Green beans (2 pounds)-----	.35
Pork sausage (pound)-----	.79
Potatoes (10 pounds)-----	1.50
Lettuce (head)-----	.29

I am not the richest person in the District of Columbia, nor am I the poorest, but it gets discouraging to even go into a store, and try to make up a meal. Cabbage and potatoes and hamburger used to be a poor man's diet. Now even the rich can't afford them.

Something should be done. The food stamps being issued to welfare people so that they can get decent food can't possibly go too far on the prices prevailing in the chainstores that they should go to.

It is unbelievable that 2 pounds of bacon can be 79 cents 1 month and the next month it jumps to \$1.15 (A&P).

If we are to be a healthy nation and are to eat proteins, vegetables, fruit, etc., prices must be reasonable.

As I am a Washington, D.C., resident and have no representation except all the Members of Congress, etc., I feel that I can write to any one of them and be heard (maybe that's even better than one Representative).

What the FSA Can Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Free Society Association has been much discussed. The following editorial from the Arizona Republic, in my opinion, puts the association and its founders in proper context. Therefore, I include it in the Record under authority previously granted.

WHAT THE FSA CAN DO

The Free Society Association has received more brickbats than bouquets since it was launched by Barry Goldwater last month.

Ray Bliss, Republican national chairman, doesn't like it because he is afraid it will drain off contributions that might otherwise go to the national committee. Liberal Republicans criticize it as being "divisive" and say they are opposed to splinter organizations. Some Democrats have dismissed it as a vehicle for right-wing extremism.

Phoenix Attorney Denison Kitchel told a press conference this week that the FSA hoped to further the principles of conservatism in both the Republican and the Democratic parties. However, he said, the organization would probably have more effect on the Republicans, who tend to be more conservative than Democrats. But the main objective, he said, would be to "enable the American voter, operating within the framework of our two-party system, to make political decisions which will be, once again, based on principles."

In one of its earlier statements, the Free Society Association listed among its goals: (1) To promote understanding of the principles of constitutional government; (2) to suggest how the problems of today fit into the Constitution; (3) to draw a clear distinction between the principles of a free society and the tenets of irresponsible leadership.

In commenting on these objectives, Judd Arnett wrote in the Detroit Free Press: "It certainly does no harm for groups of citizens, of whichever political persuasion, to study their government and worry about it."

"What this country lacks is dedicated opposition, on an increasing scale, to deficit spending, burgeoning centralization of government, and a tendency to be expedient every time a new crisis arises. If the Free Society Association can do anything to stiffen the backbones of those who have doubts concerning current trends, there is a place for it."

So far as we are concerned, we think the FSA ought to be given a chance to see what it can do. Goldwater has said it won't endorse candidates, so maybe Bliss is wrong in foreseeing a loss of GOP revenue. What the Free Society Association will do, as we see it, is try to explain the philosophical basis for conservatism. That is indeed a logical goal, and one that receives all too little attention across the country.

Most of the Nation's intellectuals are committed to the liberal cause. You can count conservative eggheads almost on the fingers of one hand—at least those who are willing to stand up and defend the conservative cause. The reason probably is that they have virtually no base for operations. The liberals have a lively and energetic press going for them. They have such effective opinion-molders as the Fund for the Republic and a host of other platforms sponsored by the big foundations. The vast majority of academic types are on their side.

And yet, no one with a sense of history can honestly believe that all wisdom and sound judgment lie to the left of a political spectrum. The conservatives need, and should have, a means of creating and disseminating ideas. We hope the Free Society Association will give it to them. As for direct political action, that can best be left to the regular party machinery.

Divided Loyalty an Undivided View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in this changing world I believe that the views

of the military and of civilians, as well, are important. The adequacy of national strength must remain a legitimate topic of political debate. I do not believe, however, that disputes should publicly be aired. The statements of military men who appear not to be under effective control inspire mistrust at the very time that peaceful solutions demand the greatest degree of mutual confidence. Similarly, in a shrinking world, the Communist bloc often is given much aid and comfort by the public criticisms of administration policy uttered by civilians in high places.

I feel that military views in time of war, whether it be hot or cold, should be given careful consideration before policy decisions, which are based upon military factors, are taken. To do less can endanger the preservation of our Nation's security.

I would like to include in the RECORD the following well-written article by Lt. Col. A. R. Richstein, U.S. Army:

[From Military Review, August 1965]

DIVIDED LOYALTY AN UNDIVIDED VIEW

(By Lt. Col. A. R. Richstein, U.S. Army)

Carl Sandburg tells a story about President Abraham Lincoln's relationship with Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan. The latter occasionally made political statements on matters outside the military field, and, after one such occurrence, someone asked Lincoln what he would reply to McClellan. Lincoln answered: "Nothing, but it reminds me of the man whose horse kicked up and stuck his foot through the stirrups. He said to the horse, 'If you are going to get on, I will get off.'"

In these days of sudden crises and threatened holocaust, when the nature of war as we know it is changing, we can ill afford any uncertainty as to the direction in which military loyalties lie.

If, indeed, as suggested by the author of a recent article in the Military Review, there are competing legal demands by the President and the Constitution upon the loyalties of military officers, the situation is deserving of further analysis.¹

The problem, as seen by this particular author, can be summarized in certain quotations taken from his article:

The first allegiance of all Americans can only be to the Constitution, "the law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace."

Our forefathers * * * created a constitutional form of government in order to safeguard the powers which by nature they possessed. But what would be the consequences if those who derive their authority from the Constitution to direct the military forces of the country step outside the limiting bounds of their constitutional authority?

LIMITS OF AUTHORITY

To determine the consequences, it is necessary to determine the limits of the constitutional authority which restrains military decision. The historical forces which influence the concept of war power under the Constitution are twofold:

The founders of the American Republic were aware that again and again in the course of human affairs liberty had been destroyed by military dictatorship. In drafting the Constitution, therefore, they sought to establish—quite firmly—the supremacy of the President and the Congress over the military arm of the Government.

The experience gained in war. This concept of the war power rests, as pointed out by Dean Eugene V. Rostow, "on basic political principles which men who endured those

¹ Lt. Col. Thomas H. Reese, "Divided Loyalty for the Military Officer," Military Review, October 1964, pp. 15-20.

July 20, 1965

A3924

times of trouble fully discussed and carefully articulated." This experience undoubtedly motivated Alexander Hamilton to say: "Of all the cares or concerns of government, the direction of war most peculiarly demands those qualities which distinguish the exercise of power by a single hand."

PRESIDENTIAL OBLIGATIONS

The President alone is singled out by the Constitution to take an oath that he "will faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States, and . . . preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." Apart from this oath, the President is separately required by article I, section 3 of the Constitution to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and [to] commission all officers of the United States."

These Presidential obligations, imposed by the Constitution, strongly motivated President Harry S. Truman in his decision to relieve Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the Korean war. In his "Memoirs," President Truman, referring to General MacArthur, recalls:

"Now at last, his actions had frustrated a political course decided upon, in conjunction with its allies, by the Government he was sworn to serve. If I allowed him to defy the civil authorities in this manner, I myself would be violating my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution."

What of the responsibility of those who direct the military forces of the country? In most situations, the exercise of authority in the name of military necessity will not present a controversy for judicial decision. Some actions, though, considered a necessary exercise of the war power or proper use of the military arm, do involve the type of conflict over property or personal rights which can be presented to the courts.

In one case, the Supreme Court clearly stated that the circumstances surrounding the exertion of power over private constitutional rights "is necessarily one for judicial inquiry in an appropriate proceeding directed against the individual charged with the transgression." Although the relationship of civil to military authority is not often litigated, the Court's few declarations on the subject have furnished certain definitive guidelines.

DONIPHAN EXPEDITION

A landmark case is one which arose out of the Doniphan expedition during the Mexican War. The plaintiff, a U.S. citizen engaged in a trading expedition to Mexico, had been permitted to follow Gen. Stephan W. Kearny's troops as they moved into New Mexico and to trade freely in the rear areas.

Subsequently, after command of the troops had passed to Col. Alexander W. Doniphan, the plaintiff, who wanted to leave the Army and trade with the inhabitants, was forced to accompany the troops. All his property was lost in battle or on the march. He brought an action against the defendant, a lieutenant colonel of the U.S. Army who had seized the property, for its value and damages.

In its opinion, the Supreme Court of the United States recognized that:

"There are, without doubt, occasions in which private property may lawfully be taken possession of or destroyed to prevent it from falling into the hands of the public enemy; and also where a military officer, charged with particular duty, may impress private property into the public service or take it for public use. Unquestionably, in such cases, the Government is bound to make full compensation to the owner but the officer is not a trespasser."

However, the Court was clearly of the opinion that in all such cases, the danger had to be immediate and impending. In affirming the lower court's findings for the plaintiff, the Court indicated that mere action to

promote the public service, in the absence of an immediate and impending danger, is not sufficient to avoid liability.

In World War II the Supreme Court had opportunity further to examine the scope of the war power under the Constitution. In a series of cases arising out of wartime treatment of Japanese aliens and citizens of Japanese descent, the Court laid down the general rule that, in determining legality, it would seek to ascertain whether the danger existed and whether the action taken was the appropriate means to minimize the danger.

LEGALITY OF ORDERS

The liability of the officers or members of the military services called upon to carry out an order must also be considered. In an early case, the Court said significantly:

"The first duty of a soldier is obedience, and without this, there can be neither discipline nor efficiency in the Army. If every subordinate officer and soldier were at liberty to question the legality of orders of the commander, and obey them or not as he may consider them valid or invalid, the camp would be turned into a debating school, where the precious moment for action would be wasted in wordy conflicts between the advocates of conflicting opinions."

The Court laid down the rule—which has generally been followed in cases involving criminal liability—that, unless the act is "a plain case of excess of authority where it is apparent to the commonest understanding that the order is illegal," the law should excuse a military subordinate when acting in obedience to the order of his commander.

The foregoing rule has recently been reaffirmed by a California court in the following language:

"It is established that a member of the Armed Forces may not be held liable to a civilian for injuries resulting from his act in carrying out the orders of a superior unless the order is not only illegal but its illegality would be at once palpable to one possessing the knowledge which is to be expected to him who obeys it."

In the case which arose out of the Doniphan expedition, the defendant, who was held liable for the damage sustained by the plaintiff, had acted pursuant to orders given by his commander, Colonel Doniphan. The Supreme Court, in its opinion in the case, implies that "it can never be maintained that a military officer can justify himself for doing an unlawful act by producing the order of his superior."

The basis for its decision, however, was a finding that:

"The defendant does not stand, in the situation of an officer, who merely obeys the command of his superior. For it appears that he advised the order and volunteered to execute it, when, according to military usage that duty more properly belonged to an officer of inferior grade."

It is the President of the United States who is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; who is required by the Constitution to take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution; and who is required by the Constitution to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and to commission all officers of the United States. In determining the constitutionality of action taken under the war power, the courts will ascertain whether a threatened danger was imminent and whether an action taken was the appropriate means to minimize it.

Unless the act of a subordinate officer is such that a man of ordinary sense and understanding would know that it was illegal, in most cases an act performed in good faith and without malice would not incur liability.

Under those circumstances, officers should readily find their oaths to support and defend the Constitution completely compatible with loyalty to their Commander in Chief.

Any other solution would defeat the very purpose for which they are commissioned.

It has been emphasized by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that:

"The Nation looks to the President to play the primary role in deciding the types and scale of military power it needs to defend itself and support its policy. He must look to the morale of our fighting men, assure them of the Nation's appreciation and support. On the other hand, he must firmly assert the principle that the first mission of a man in uniform is to do what he is told to do, regardless of the number of stars on his shoulder, and that the military establishment is an instrument, not the master of policy."

The American tradition of civilian control is strong, and the tradition of loyalty among professional officers has always been high. The legal basis for these traditions has long been settled.

Letting Rogers
Florida Press Cites U.S. Efforts in
Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida press has reflected much of the public feeling for the President taking a stand in Vietnam. A State which has new citizens from many States, and which plays host to visitors from many other States, Florida is exposed to many cross currents of American public opinion.

It was therefore significant when the Miami News, one of Florida's leading newspapers, editorialized on the President's efforts to reach some sort of peaceful solution to Vietnam without endangering the U.S. position of firmness there.

I include the Miami News editorial of June 27 in the Record at this point:

FRUSTRATION CALLED VIETNAM

It is only natural that our long involvement in South Vietnam should produce varying views by leading Democrats and Republicans alike in Congress. The pleasant aspect is that President Johnson's policy has brought so little public criticism.

Seldom, if ever, in our history has a President been confronted with such a frustrating problem. We were committed to help South Vietnam resist a Communist takeover during the Eisenhower administrations. We sent military advisers to aid the South Vietnamese Army resist attacks by Communist Vietcong guerrillas. The late President Kennedy inherited the problem and under him and President Johnson our assistance has been stepped up.

President Johnson has invited a negotiated settlement, he has stepped up American participation in the hope of persuading North Vietnam and the Vietcong that they cannot win. Thus far negotiation has been spurned by the Communists.

Probably the most clearheaded appraisal of the situation was given by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the Senate the day after he conferred with President Johnson.

Senator FULBRIGHT urged a "resolute but restrained" holding action in Vietnam until

July 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3925

the Communists see the futility of trying to win a military victory and agree to negotiate.

With this objective in view we have committed American forces to combat. Our military strength in Vietnam is more than 60,000 and is expected to reach 100,000 shortly. After a pause in our bombing of North Vietnam military objectives, in the hope negotiations might be initiated, we resumed the bombing.

Just how much pressure we must employ to accomplish a negotiated settlement is still unclear. Certainly such a policy is to be preferred to all-out war, with the Communist Chinese joining in, or a withdrawal which would doom all of southeast Asia to Communist conquest.

We Refuse To Be Drowned**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. FRANK E. EVANS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, following the June floods that lashed at some areas in Colorado, I have been dramatically reminded of the fighting spirit of our people during times of crisis and disaster. The following editorial "We Refuse To Be Drowned," by the Fred Betz family, publishers of the Lamar Daily News, graphically expresses this spirit.

WE REFUSE TO BE DROWNED

There is little doubt that the flood of June 18 was about the worst catastrophe which has hit this community in a half century. Hardly a home or business house in Holly, Granada, and Lamar escaped without some damage. Even those spared by the raging floodwaters meant a loss for someone interested in the property.

But even mightier than the flood is the spirit of the people as they begin to dig out and to rehabilitate homes, stores, plants, and to reinstate the normal operations which mean their livelihood.

Brave words, smiles and bantering, in many instances, are being used to cover monetary losses which can eventually mean the loss of a home, a savings account, or even a business establishment. In some cases the flood came as the crowning blow on almost 4 years of drouth.

However, one gradually gets an understanding of the composite spirit of the people of the area, who are determined that they will survive. Because of the lack of communication, many persons outside the immediate area have not as this is written, understood how heavy a blow has been dealt and what its implications could be. But those who are engaged in the day-to-day struggle to lift themselves out of the morass of water and mud present a heroic picture equal to that of their frontier ancestors.

In the past half century this area has withstood the Pueblo flood of 1921, the dust storm era of the 30's, the influenza epidemic of World War I days, and drouths of varying length. After each of these we have witnessed a recovery based upon faith, sheer courage, and determination to not be destroyed.

In keeping with this spirit this newspaper with its plant built over many years into one of the better small city daily operations in Colorado wishes to walk shoulder to shoulder with the people of this area. The publishers have this day signed con-

tracts involving many thousands of dollars for the installation of complete new printing equipment of the most modern type. Manufacturers are cooperating and it is our hope that in a matter of days we will be able to help with the restoration of a greater Arkansas Valley.

FRED M. BETZ, Sr.
FRED M. BETZ, Jr.
MRS. LENNIE M. BETZ.
MRS. BARBARA LEE BETZ.

Adlai Stevenson's Last Visit to Hawaii**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson, brings back memories of his third and last visit to Hawaii in March 1953. He was honored on that occasion by island Democrats at a luau—Hawaiian feast—where I had the privilege of meeting him. His brilliance of expression and his personal charm wowed the people of Hawaii, and he in turn seemed to enjoy the friendly and relaxing atmosphere in which he found himself.

Adlai Stevenson's 1953 visit to Hawaii is reviewed in a newspaper article which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on July 14, 1965. I am sure that the article, a reprint of which follows, will be of great interest to my colleagues: [From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 14, 1965]

ADLAI'S 1953 VISIT HERE WOWED DEMOCRATS

Adlai E. Stevenson's visit to Honolulu March 7-9, 1953, was a smashing success for island Democrats, even though their man had been defeated at the polls only 4 months before.

The highlight of Stevenson's trip was a luau at the jam-packed American Chinese Club on Kapiolani Boulevard.

It seemed to take an hour for local Democrats to escort Stevenson to the head table that evening and Democrats were ecstatic.

Everywhere he was greeted by reaching hands.

The trip was Stevenson's third and last.

He had visited Hawaii in 1933 as a tourist-businessman, and in 1942 he was here as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, accompanying Secretary Frank Knox on an inspection tour of the war zone.

Stevenson arrived here in 1953 on the liner *President Wilson*. He was making a 4-month world tour with three companions, his secretary, William Blair, Barry Bingham of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Prof. Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago.

Loaded down with leis on arrival, Stevenson said, "I smell like an undertaker's establishment."

At the luau, Stevenson opened with the comments, "After hearing all the lovely things that Governor Long had to say about me I can hardly wait to hear what I'm going to say."

Seeing the joyous faces at the luau, Stevenson asked, "How many days does this go on?"

Someone yelled, "The next President of the United States."

Stevenson answered, "I have not yet accepted the nomination."

He said he was "sort of between jobs as results of a misadventure that overtook me last fall."

His serious comments referred to the Pacific becoming the hub of the universe and of Hawaii lying in the path of the center of political gravity that was moving constantly westward.

Among the Republicans to greet Stevenson at the luau was Mrs. Walter F. Dillingham, a cousin of Blair.

When he looked down at the kalua pig in front of him Stevenson said, "I have particularly enjoyed this animal that lies prostrate here before me as I was assured when I came in and examined him that he was a roasted Republican."

Washington Post Editorial Backs Teacher Fellowship and Teacher Corps Proposals**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 9, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of July 20, 1965, carries an editorial which strongly endorses the concepts of a national teacher fellowship program and a National Teacher Corps.

The General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee are now considering such proposals, and President Johnson on July 17, 1965, called on Congress to enact teacher fellowship and teacher corps programs during this session.

The editorial follows:

ARCHITECTS OF THE FUTURE

It can hardly be doubted that the chief architects of the American future, as President Johnson put it in advocating a National Teacher Corps, are the country's teachers. Yet very little has been done to improve the caliber of these architects or to recruit enough of them to meet the enlarging challenge of the country's schools. The most tragic consequence of America's three-decade neglect of its public school system is to be found not in the antiquated and inadequate school buildings which so many American children are obliged to attend but in the deficient preparation and professional shortcomings of so many of their teachers. The President gave some figures on this point—shocking figures. Only one-fourth of the country's public school teachers have a master's degree; a year of graduate work in educational theories and methods together with some advanced training in the teacher's subject ought to be a pretty general standard of qualification, at least for teachers at the high school and junior high school levels. Almost 10 percent of the country's teachers, according to the President, have less than a bachelor's degree, and almost 5 percent—85,000—lack adequate certification. This is to say that in a great many instances the vital business of education is entrusted to the uneducated.

Senators NELSON and KENNEDY have been talking for some time about a national teacher corps, patterned in some degree upon the Peace Corps. Mr. Johnson has taken their proposals, enriched them with related ideas from several other legislators and presented to Congress a rounded and realistic

A3926

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 20, 1965

bill to let the Federal Government help local school systems raise the quality of their teachers. He is quite right to call upon Congress to do something about this at once—during the present session. For it is really indispensable to the rest of his education program and it is unsurpassed in importance by any other national need.

In brief, the proposed Teaching Professions Act of 1965 would create a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel designed to lift their qualifications; it would also create a National Teacher Corps in which experienced teachers and teacher-interns with a bachelor's degree but no teaching experience would work together in institutions of higher education, engaging at the same time in an in-service teacher training program for the teacher-interns. This would operate like the master-of-arts-in-teaching programs provided currently by a number of leading universities.

Schoolteaching needs to be professionalized—lifted in dignity and prestige as well as in pay. For far too long, the profession has been the province of unmarried women reluctant to leave home for the rough competition of business in the big cities, and of married women seeking to supplement their husbands' incomes with a teaching stipend. More men are needed, especially in high schools. And high professional standards should be applied to men and women alike in this most influential of callings. We think the President's program is a most imaginative and constructive approach to an urgently needed revitalization of the teaching profession.

Opportunity in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Mr. J. W. Rosenthal, chief of the Routes and Agreements Division, Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered a very illuminating speech on the great opportunities for expanding air passenger travel in all segments of the airline industry. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this address, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD:

OPPORTUNITY IN THE AIR

(Remarks of J. W. Rosenthal, Chief, Routes and Agreements Division, Civil Aeronautics Board, before the National Industrial Recreation Association—Travel Council—Las Vegas, Nev., Feb. 18, 1965)

I am sure that most of you have noticed that motion pictures usually contain a legend at the beginning, that "Any resemblance to living persons or actual events is purely coincidental."

Staff members of a government agency have a similar caution when they undertake the hazard of public expression of their views. Thus, let me state accurately and completely that I personally prepared, and am solely responsible for any facts, opinions, interpretations, and predictions which may be buried in my ensuing remarks. Further, let me say that I reserve the right to change my mind, with or without the receipt of additional facts, on any of the conclusions of which you may wish to find me guilty.

Let us begin.

Most analysts agree that there are two relatively distinct markets in air transporta-

tion—a business travel market, and a personal and recreational travel market.

A significant part of the business travel market is seeking simply better personal communication. The sole purpose of this travel is to bring individuals face to face. This objective accounts in part for the rapid growth of the airport motel, and for the traveler who seldom strays to town.

But the growth of business travel is not only tied to growth of business activity; it is directly threatened by revolutionary innovations in communications technology. The face-to-face meeting made increasingly possible by increased aircraft speed and availability may in the future, at lesser cost, be accomplished through phonovision. Accordingly, one must approach a long-term forecast of growth based upon business travel with somewhat greater caution than has heretofore been the case.

Communications technology will also affect the desire for pleasure and personal travel—but not to the same degree. After all, the telephone, with or without a picture, is hardly a substitute for home cooking, and it cannot take the place of a visit in person for courting, weddings, births, or burial occasions. Nor can it provide an opportunity to ski, swim, golf, tour new and strange places, or just plain getting away from it all—including the telephone.

All of the transportation surveys suggest that there is a tremendous and as yet untapped potential for personal travel. At least one such survey suggests that the great bulk of our people, including many who can well afford to do so, almost never travel more than 200 miles from home.

And as the standard of living increases in this country and in the rest of the world, the number of persons having discretionary income, and the amount they have increases geometrically. Accordingly, one may almost assume that there is an almost unlimited expansion potential in the market for personal travel.

However, the competition for this discretionary part of the consumer dollar is fierce. To name just a few, the automobile concerns, the appliance makers, the furniture dealers, the fashion purveyors are all heavily engaged in the exercise of ingenuity to corral our uncommitted cartwheels.

Historically, airline thinking, while not monolithic, has been dominated by operations and finance people. The basic sales effort has been to attract traffic from existing travel markets; to divert existing common carrier surface traffic to air, and to capture air traffic from competitive air carriers.

Symptomatic of this approach has been the frequently expressed thought of a few years back that air traffic growth would be largely unresponsive to changes in fare levels but would respond directly to growth in GNP. Such assumptions restrict progressive development of airline fare policies; they lead to the almost reflex conclusion of some airline executives that every industry financial crisis can be best solved by a fare increase. Also affected is airline policy toward travel agents and credit availability. After all, if the business is largely going to come to you anyway, why pay someone to sell it, or someone else to finance it.

But change is in the air. In recent years, several of the large airlines have hired marketing specialists from other industries with a stronger merchandising background. Their initial approach is fresh. They accept the thought that air traffic growth—at least the part which is nonbusiness travel—is elastic. They argue that the air carriers and their hotel and tour allies are in competition with other entrepreneurs for the consumer dollar.

We can only guess that the carriers' current greater willingness to experiment with reduced promotional fares is attributable, in part, to the new enterprise of the marketing

men. We can be sure that they upheld the passengers' rights to a choice, rather than just one class of service; to the greater availability of credit; and to the recent more sympathetic airline approach to travel agents.

But the battle is far from over. There is still opposition within the ranks to the new effort.

We are once again hearing that in the next few years the carriers' jet fleets will expand faster than anticipated traffic growth. Only recently have load factors started to move significantly above the 50 percent mark. Should the direction change, the resulting financial crisis should be solved—it is said—by fare increases.

Sometimes, I wonder just how high fares are now. Just how much is the public paying, over and above what would be considered reasonable, if airlines were subject to the same economic forces as are other industries? Of course, a lot of arguments may be validly made as to why it would be inappropriate to test the efficiency and economy of airline managements—subject to public regulations and imposed service obligations—by the standards of another industry. However, it is more difficult to challenge a comparison of their performance today with that of the prejet era.

For example, let us assume that the airlines were today operating the more efficient jets at the same utilization rate and load factor as they operated their piston equipment in a comparable period of economic activity. On that basis an overall 25 percent cut in fares could be passed on to the public.

Certainly, we are entitled to question whether it is reasonable for the public to be asked to pay this kind of a premium for further equipment expansion. This is particularly true when the air carriers' own forecasts are for further reductions in an already low rate of use of very costly equipment.

This brings me to the role of the supplemental air carriers and charter service.

For some years, we have pointed to the value of the transatlantic charter program as demonstrative of the availability of a mass travel market—at a price—and as both incentive and prod to the scheduled carriers to reduce fares to serve this new public.

Let us attempt to evaluate this contribution. Of course, one must recognize that in a complex business situation it is difficult, if not impossible, to attribute any result to a single cause. Nonetheless, it is most interesting to contrast domestic and transatlantic fare levels in the year 1955 with those in 1965. As you may recall, 1955 was the year in which the major nonscheduled transcontinental operator was put out of business by court order. It was also the year in which the Board inaugurated the transatlantic charter program. In 1955, the DC-6 transcontinental round trip coach fare was \$198.00, and a lesser \$180.00 excursion fare was available on certain days of the week. In 1965, the jet coach fare is \$290.20, 46 percent higher than the 1955 level; moreover, in 1965 there is no lower price excursion fare available. In 1955, the on-season New York/London round trip coach fare was \$522—and there was no excursion or group fare available. In 1965, the on-season New York/London economy fare is under \$500 but, more significantly, the carriers offer a \$300 round trip 21-day excursion fare, as well as a low group fare.

Equally pertinent is the fact that the domestic trunk revenue yields per passenger mile have increased since 1955, while the U.S.-flag international yield has declined substantially. In fact, in 1965 Pan American for the first time had a lower system yield per revenue passenger mile than any one of the three domestic transcontinental trunks.

It may interest you to know that the value of the supplemental and the transatlantic charter program to the Board's effort to

July 20, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180007-3

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3921

around Morristown. The troops spent the winter of 1779-80 in Jockey Hollow. It was here that General de Lafayette arrived with the happy news of the second French expedition to aid the hard-pressed Continentals. The campground is much as it was then.

— OLD GRAVESITE

The National Park Service has constructed a representative camp hospital from original plans prepared by Dr. James Tilton, troop surgeon in 1779-80 and later Surgeon General of the U.S. Army. This is the second point of interest on your park tour along the old camp road. Directly across is an old burying ground where 100 some soldiers who could not survive the bitter winter were buried. Up on a hill overlooking the parade ground, the Park Service has carefully reconstructed several log huts, typical of those used by the officers during that bitter winter. There are no statistics on how many might have gone up in smoke, but the log chimneys look anything but fireproof. From here, you continue along Wick Road, to Sugar Loaf Road, back to Wick House and out.

The Ford mansion in Morristown was constructed by Col. Jacob Ford, Jr., an iron manufacturer, just before the start of the war. The building, in excellent condition, was partially restored by the National Park Service in 1939 and is furnished with authentic pieces of the period, including some of the original furniture in use in the mansion when Washington stayed there. One historic piece is the tall secretary desk at which the Commander in Chief penned his orders and some of the most important documents of his military career.

LECTURES GIVEN

The museum is directly behind the mansion. Here are many original objects, mementoes of the Continental Army's winter encampments at Morristown. These are supplemented by photographs, arms collections, prints, and Colonial artifacts. Lectures, illustrated by colored slides, are given in the museum auditorium.

Wick House in Jockey Hollow Park is open Tuesday through Saturday from 1 to 5 p.m., and on Sunday from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. There is no charge for admission to the farmhouse or Jockey Hollow Park. The Ford Mansion and historical museum are open Tuesday through Sunday, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Admission is 50 cents for adults. Children under 16 or groups of children under 18 accompanied by adults are admitted free.

There are picnic grounds in Jockey Hollow for those who wish to bring their lunch. But no fires or cooking are permitted in the 957 some acre park.

Actual mileage from downtown Paterson, using scenic route 202 through Wayne, Lincoln Park, Towaco, Boonton, Parsippany-Troy Hills, Morris Plains, and Morristown, is 85 miles one way. This can be shortened somewhat by using Route 46 to Route 202 at the Parsippany-Troy Hills intersection.

Help the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have expressed my shock, concern, sympathy, and intention to continue to assist in every way possible the oppressed people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who are cur-

rently suffering under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

These gallant peoples with their appealing, inspiring history and devotion to the principles of freedom have made it clear to the whole world time and time again that they intend to continue their fight, and to die if necessary, for their national independence and freedom.

This Nation maintains diplomatic relations with the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and has consistently refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union.

A select committee of this House has found that the incorporation of these nations was contrary to established principles of international law. I will go further and state that the oppression that they have suffered since that incorporation is brutal, unspeakable, inhuman, and violative of human rights.

It was contemplated and agreed at international conferences between the Soviet Union and the Allies during World War II that plebiscites would be held to allow subject peoples affected by the executive agreements if they chose to set up their own independent governments under principles of self-determination.

These agreements, like many others, have not been kept by the Soviet Union. To the contrary, they have been grossly violated by imposing upon these helpless peoples dictatorial control of their lives and affairs, and in many cases forcing them into exile and imprisonment in Siberia and other slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

Obviously, this Government should not and cannot condone this illegal, inhuman conduct, and neither can it continue to ignore the sorrowful plight of these peoples and other similarly afflicted peoples who are being ground down under the heel of Soviet tyranny, denied their basic rights as free men and women, and held captive under dictatorial masters.

I hope that our Government will urge, not only in the United Nations, but on its own account, an end to these conditions, and a fair, honest, opportunity for these peoples to vote upon their status, and determine once and for all whether they propose to remain by force in the Soviet orbit, or whether they want to establish their own free, independent government, a right that was granted to them under international agreements and is one of the sacred rights of man.

I am greatly concerned about the plight of these peoples to whom I have alluded, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that our Government will make it very clear to the Soviet Union, our allies, and to the world, that we stand wholeheartedly, firmly and irrevocably for all those who are being held captive throughout the world by the armed might of the Communist conspiracy and we will do everything in our power to assist them.

Men are born free and none of them must be kept in chains.

RESOLUTION TO HELP THE BALTIC STATES

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of people everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, while on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communists regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic process, and in fact took over these countries by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the free Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives, created by House Resolution 346 of the 83d Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, was contrary to established principles of international law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. Congress, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to do the following:

1. To withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, colonists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

2. To return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Russian Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

JUNE 28, 1965.

Mr. LEONARD VALIUKAS,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR LEONARD: I was glad to hear from you.

I may state that I have exerted very extensive efforts in the House and elsewhere in behalf of the liberation of the Baltic States and other states similarly oppressed, over a long period of time.

My thought was, in response to your request, that you should direct this resolution to your own Congressman and that is a procedure required by the traditions and practices of the House of Representatives.

I may state that I am in complete agreement with the objectives of the resolution anyway but I think you should follow the procedures and present this matter through your own Congressman since I have already introduced the resolution.

Warm regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

P.S.—I am enclosing some of my recent speeches in these matters.

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL
ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC
STATES,

Los Angeles, June 17, 1965.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Your letter of June 14, 1965, was received and greatly appreciated. I am sorry to say that your letter does not satisfy us.

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180007-3

A3922

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - APPENDIX

July 20, 1965

For your information, we have a considerable number of members who are from the Third Congressional District, State of Massachusetts. In other words, they are your constituents. We have received a good number of letters from these members (your constituents) who are asking us whether or not you have introduced a resolution concerning the Baltic States. We have been writing to them and telling them that you most likely would do that. From your letter of June 14 it does not seem to us that you are in a mood to do that.

By introducing a resolution you would not lose anything; on the contrary, you would gain a great deal. First, you would further the freedom cause for the Baltic States; secondly, you would make many new friends and supporters among the Baltic Americans in your Congressional District. Again, we ask you kindly to introduce a resolution that we are mailing to you as a House Concurrent Resolution. We hope that you will do it without further delay. Thank you.

With all good wishes and regards,

Sincerely,

LEONARD VALIUKAS,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

JUNE 14, 1965.

Mr. LEONARD VALIUKAS,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR LEONARD: I appreciated your letter of some time ago which was lost in my heavy volume of mail and has just come to my attention.

As you know, I have been very active in endeavoring to help your cause ever since I was elected to Congress and propose to continue my efforts.

With reference to the resolution, I think you should refer it to your own Congressman if you have not already done so because it would seem more appropriate that he should introduce it.

Please know I will continue my efforts for the cause of the oppressed Baltic States.

Warm regards and best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL
ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC
STATES.

Los Angeles, March 12, 1965.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Thanks for your excellent remarks that you made recently in the U.S. Congress in commemorating the Lithuanian Independence day.

As you know, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet slavery since June 15, 1940. We, as leaders of the free world, should go ahead and help the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to get rid of the Communists yoke there. Unquestionably, we can do that through the United Nations.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a resolution which I kindly ask you to introduce in the U.S. Congress as a concurrent resolution. The action that our country can take is embodied in this proposed legislation. By introducing this resolution in the U.S. Congress, you would further greatly the freedom cause of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I hope that you will do it at your earliest convenience.

When this cry for liberty legislation is introduced and ready for distribution, please mail me several copies of it. Please mail me also at least four prints of your picture. I will see to it that this matter gets some first-rate publicity in all major Baltic-American newspapers that are read by many of your constituents. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LEONARD VALIUKAS,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

Hanoi May Have Built Its Own
Pandora's Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans were outraged at the brutal execution of Sgt. Harold Bennett. By this action the Vietcong may have inflamed American public opinion to the point where instead of calculated escalation the United States will be even more resolute in Vietnam, forcing the Communists to more expensive capitulation.

The Tampa Times, an articulate medium of opinion in Florida, printed an editorial discussing this aspect of the war in Vietnam. I ask that the Tampa Times editorial of June 26 be included in the Record at this point.

The editorial follows:

CRY "HAVOCK" AND LET SLIP THE DOGS OF WAR?

The North Vietnamese Communists threw all the rules of civilized behavior out the window when they executed Sgt. Harold George Bennett this week. Sergeant Bennett was technically a prisoner of war, captured December 29 during vicious fighting at Binh Gia in South Vietnam. He was killed, according to announcements from North Vietnam, in reprisal for the execution of several Red terrorists by the South Vietnamese Government.

This wanton act brands the North Vietnamese regime totally criminal. It is certain to increase demands in the United States that the Johnson administration abandon its calculated escalation policy, aimed at forcing Reds to the peace table, and launch an all-out war against North Vietnam with the ultimate goal nothing short of total victory.

These demands, while premature, may be difficult to resist. The memory of Korea is still fresh in the minds of many Americans and there is no desire here to become involved in another war we have no intention of winning.

President Johnson has repeatedly stated his willingness to negotiate a peace in southeast Asia based on the simple solution that North Vietnam cease its attacks on South Vietnam. But his offers have been spurned. British Commonwealth leaders have formed a peace team in an effort to cool off the heated situation in the Far East. But it, too, has been rebuffed by communism.

The Reds are moving inexorably toward a bitter showdown which would invite a full nuclear response by the United States. It is unrealistic to imagine that this country would commit itself to limited war against the ceaseless tides of manpower available to Red China. It is also unrealistic to expect that the United States and its allies in South Vietnam will retreat before threats and intimidation implied in the murder of Sgt. Bennett. Hanoi has its hand on a box containing far more evils than Pandora ever released.

If the Communists are not students of Shakespeare, they should be. There is a lesson in the resentment generated in Mark Antony by the assassination of Caesar—an anger not unlike resentment generated now by the brutal murder of Sgt. Bennett.

As we recall, Antony declared:

"Woe to the hand that shed this costly blood.

"Over thy wounds now do I prophesy,
"All pity chok'd with custom of fell deeds:

"And Caesar's spirit, ranging for revenge,
"With Ante by his side, come hot from hell,
"Shall in these confines, with a monarch's voice,
"Cry 'Havock,' and let slip the dogs of war;
"That this foul deed shall smell above the earth
"With carrion men groaning for burial."

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1965, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3345, a table of comparative food prices for May and June 1965, compiled by U.S. News & World Report.

The table documented the enormous food price increases which occurred during just the 1-month period between May and June, and which every housewife has experienced. The poor with large families suffer most of all when food prices go up.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor are the most culpable contributors to these inordinate price increases.

At this very moment, the two Departments are shamelessly conspiring to gain congressional approval of two bills which would result in even higher food prices—to the further detriment of the poor, as well as the taxpayer.

First. The omnibus agriculture bill would provide additional subsidies for some farmers—and increase the price of bread to consumers. The legislation could not stand on its own merits.

Second. The administration and some of my colleagues are beholden to the leaders of organized labor and thus are committed to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the individual States to enact so-called right-to-work laws. It appears, however, that they do not now have sufficient votes for repeal on its own merits.

Therefore, the administration plan is, in effect, to combine the farm bill and repeal of 14(b) into a single package. Members of Congress from agricultural areas are being asked to vote for repeal of 14(b) in return for promises that Members from the cities will support the farm measure.

Such "logrolling" legislative maneuvers are detrimental to nearly everyone—the taxpayer who pays the subsidies, the worker who does not wish to be forced into union membership to hold his job, and the consumer who requires bread as an essential part of his daily diet.

Mr. Speaker, when food prices go up again—as they surely will—the blame must be assigned to those who are responsible—the administration, the Departments of Agriculture and Labor. All of the welfare and poverty programs in the world will not keep pace with the

July 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16929

crack in the door just wide enough for glimpses to be had of the unbelievable misuse of this program across the Nation.

This minute glimpse was sufficient to show that the community action program is little more than a sham—a hoax upon the poor.

In light of these facts the Republican policy committee is opposed to the bill as written. We join the minority members of the committee in the hope that the bill will not be enacted unless the following steps are taken:

1. An investigation of the entire existing program by a bipartisan committee selected by the Speaker.

2. The restoration of the veto power of State Governors and the institution of arrangements for State coordination of community action programs.

3. The appointment of a full-time administrator who is barred from holding other Federal posts.

4. The reduction of the authorization of funds to the present level until a proper evaluation of the existing act can be undertaken and completed.

In the name of the poverty stricken of the Nation who need pity, not patronage for politicians, protection and assistance, not shining promises, we urge that these essential measures be undertaken immediately.

NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGION CALLS FOR NATIONAL CEMETERY IN NEW ENGLAND

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, the American Legion, department of New Hampshire, completed a most productive convention, adopting a series of resolutions concerning issues of importance to the Nation generally, and to veterans in particular. I was especially pleased to note the Legion's endorsement for proposals to establish a national cemetery in New England. On March 24, I introduced H.R. 6678, a duplicate of a bill I sponsored in the 88th Congress for the purpose of creating such a cemetery. I heartily endorse the resolution and offer it at this point in the RECORD:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS RESOLUTION 2

Whereas there does not now exist a national cemetery anywhere in the New England States; and

Whereas there is cause for a national cemetery to be established in New England: Therefore be it

Resolved by the New Hampshire department, the American Legion, in convention assembled this 26th day of June, 1965, in Laconia, N.H., That suitable legislation be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in New England, the Secretary of the Army to acquire by gift, purchase, or condemnation an amount of land not to exceed 500 acres for the purpose of establishing such cemetery; and be it further

Resolved, That by this legislation the Secretary of the Army be authorized and directed to provide for the care and maintenance of the national cemetery established under authority of the first section of this act.

No. 131—24

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS; KEENE, N.H. GARDEN CLUB ENDORSES CLEVELAND BILL

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., has voted its support of my bill, H.R. 5647, which would establish humane standards for the treatment of experimental animals used in research financed all or in part by the Federal Government. Mrs. Alton Collier, president of the club, has forwarded to me the text of the resolution, which I offer at this point in the RECORD, along with my reply to her letter:

THE OLD HOMESTEAD GARDEN CLUB,
Swansey, N.H., July 6, 1965.
Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., has unanimously passed the following resolution:

"That the Congress and Senate committees hold hearings on humane animals legislation, without further delay, and endorse bill H.R. 5647, introduced by Representative JAMES CLEVELAND, and bill S. 1071, introduced by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, identical bills. These two bills meet the six basic humane requirements to prevent needless suffering of animals used in laboratories and other research, and urge the passage of these bills during the present session of Congress."

Respectfully,

Mrs. ALTON COLLIER,
President.

JULY 8, 1965.

Mrs. ALTON COLLIER,
President, The Old Homestead Garden Club,
Swansey, N.H.

DEAR Mrs. COLLIER: Thank you for informing me of the encouraging resolution passed by the Old Homestead Garden Club of Keene, N.H., concerning the humane treatment of experimental animals.

This support, following that recently given by the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, is very much appreciated.

In this regard, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed insert from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1965.

Regards and best wishes,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

NOW THE RECORD IS STRAIGHT

(Mr. BATTIN (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of July 7, I entered the transcript of an NBC television program, "Situation Report," of July 1, which dealt with the debate now going on in Congress about our Government's policies in Vietnam. NBC News Correspondent Robert Goralski was the commentator.

I called attention to some inaccuracies in that broadcast, particularly to a statement implying that the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference, the gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. LAIRD], had recommended that the United States "pour combat troops into South Vietnam's jungles" and that U.S. planes "would destroy everything in sight north of the 17th parallel, including Hanoi itself."

On the following Thursday, July 8, Mr. Goralski, on the same broadcast, made some clarification of his remarks when he said:

Before going into tonight's "Situation Report," I'd like to clarify a point made on last Thursday's program. In referring to Republican calls for new military efforts in Vietnam, I may have left the impression that Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was calling for a further buildup of American ground forces. Representative LAIRD has never made such a proposal * * * he's urged consideration of more extensive use of air and naval forces. The point needed clarifying.

I appreciate the correction of Mr. Goralski has made and under unanimous consent, I include the full transcript of "Situation Report" of July 8 in the RECORD at this point:

SITUATION REPORT, JULY 8

(By Robert Goralski)

South Vietnam's problems will be all too familiar to Henry Cabot Lodge when he returns to Saigon. A "Situation Report" after this.

Before going into tonight's "Situation Report," I'd like to clarify a point made on last Thursday's program. In referring to Republican calls for new military efforts in Vietnam, I may have left the impression that Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was calling for a further buildup of American ground forces there. Representative LAIRD has never made such a proposal * * * he's urged consideration of more extensive use of air and naval forces. The point needed clarifying.

Henry Cabot Lodge's reappointment as Ambassador to Saigon will probably be well received by the Vietnamese. He was always popular—he was charming and affable as he was insistence that the war be prosecuted to a successful conclusion.

But Mr. Lodge is going to find that when he returns to the Embassy in Saigon the internal political situation is just as confused as ever. Today's government may not be there tomorrow. His task is going to be made doubly difficult because of the latest premier, Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky. The young Vietnamese is impetuous and bold, and his actions are raising many an eyebrow. Ky has promised to execute war profiteers personally, picking his victims in an arbitrary manner.

What concerns most people, however, is a statement Ky reportedly made to a correspondent for the London Sunday Mirror. According to the paper, Ky said he had only one hero—that was Adolf Hitler. He is further quoted as saying what South Vietnam needs are four or five Hitlers. Since publication of the article, there's been no effort by Ky to retract.

If true, it's an appalling statement. The most immediate effect has been a propaganda field day for the Communists. Radio Moscow and other Communists news organs have picked up the remarks and are painting the United States as supporting a government headed by a man who worships the memory of Hitler. It places the United States in a most embarrassing position, to be sure.

If Ky honestly holds Hitler as his model, one might wonder what he has in store for the South Vietnamese. He's already cracked down on war profiteers, draft dodgers—desirable measures, but what's he going to do next.

Henry Cabot Lodge will undoubtedly have his hands full with Ky. Chronic political instability is not going to be relieved with Ky moving in wild directions. The colorful airman is known to favor air strikes against Hanoi; he's now taken up the call to liberate North Vietnam, presumably by an army marching north over the 17th parallel.

The months ahead should be interesting, and Henry Cabot Lodge surely will have one of the most difficult jobs in his long career of public service.

BRILLIANCE IN THE BERKSHIRES

(Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, among the most distinguished summer residents of my congressional district are the members of the Boston Symphony Orchestra and their renowned conductor, Erich Leinsdorf. For 7 weeks the beautiful Tanglewood estate overlooking Lake Mahkeenac near Lenox, Mass., becomes a musician's paradise as the Symphony gathers there to perform a series of 24 concerts comprising the Berkshire Music Festival. Tanglewood also houses an educational center where promising young musicians can study under the guidance of the most talented men in the country. This year Tanglewood is attracting such distinguished musicians as Van Cliburn, Aaron Copland, Charles Munch, Rudolf Serkin, Isaac Stern, Leopold Stokowski, and others too numerous to mention. The Harvard Glee Club and Radcliffe Choral Society will sing. Chamber music groups will perform. As a grand finale, the final weekend will be devoted to a complete performance of Richard Wagner's Lohengrin.

Presiding over this rich mélange of talent is Erich Leinsdorf. Last week Life magazine wrote a short but perceptive article about Mr. Leinsdorf, and I enjoyed it so much that I want all of my colleagues to have the opportunity to read it. I have included here the text of the article and picture captions which are self-explanatory. I regret that the RECORD has no facilities for printing Life's excellent photographs. There is one especially good one; it shows Leinsdorf in bed, his hand to his brow in a gesture of disbelief, reading a copy of the RECORD. Says Leinsdorf:

I take the RECORD to bed with me every night—and I don't mean that reading it puts me to sleep. It is marvelous. Where else can you find out exactly what is going on in this country? I especially look for WAYNE MORSE. What a maverick.

The article follows:

ERICH LEINSDORF IS BOSTON'S INSATIABLE PERFECTIONIST: THE MAESTRO DEMANDS BRILLIANCE

With fierce and tender concentration, Erich Leinsdorf hones his Boston Symphony Orchestra to brilliant precision. Perfection is his passion, and last week he was demanding it in the hills of Tanglewood, Mass., at the opening of the annual Berkshire Music

Festival. Living up to his own exacting standard, Leinsdorf has made his gem-like orchestra one of the finest ornaments of American music. "I am in heaven when I play with him," says pianist Artur Schnabel.

Vienna-born Leinsdorf, 53, made his American debut with the Metropolitan Opera in 1938 and has lived here ever since. Though stiff and uncompromising on the podium, off stage he is an amiable, gregarious father of five who collects clothes, stamps, wines, and mechanical toys. But even in these pursuits there is no such thing as a casual approach. "When my sons became interested in baseball," he says, "I briefed myself on it. I even corresponded with Red Barber." Once feared as an arrogant martinet, he has mellowed with success. "I used to think there was only one right way," he says, "but now I know there are right ways and right ways."

Here are some of Leinsdorf's comments about his world:

"Boston is a liberal city, and the old ladies on Friday afternoon are the most liberal audience because they have heard the most music. They might not like everything, but they appreciate an expanding repertory."

"We are today in a mass culture. There are more audiences, and I think it is a very exciting thing. But we are not compromising on account of our large audiences, quite the contrary."

"Today's young musicians have gone from the horse and buggy to the airplane without having gone through the railroad station. All these kids jump the 19th century. They accept Vivaldi and Bach, but they loathe Wagner and Tchaikovsky."

"I have a quiet period in the morning and always before I go to a concert, I need an awful lot of time to myself."

"There are three worlds of music—the composer's, the performer's, and the critic's. I believe in friction, for without friction there can be no progress. The music world cannot live without it."

"I've always felt that operatic work and concert work together make up a complete musical life. But in symphony conducting the conductor is a larger percentage of the show than in opera. There is not the visual to fall back on, and thus one's resources must be richer."

"My orchestra is a wonderful blend of Europe and America. You eat dinner somewhere with the orchestra and first someone comes up and addresses you in perfect French, and then along comes a young man from Indiana."

"To have been graced by providence with special aptitudes and abilities, maybe even genius, does not at once entitle the bearer to present a bill to the world for remittance."

"Conducting is a matter of knowing that there is much you don't conduct. It's constantly alternating between listening and leading. Beating time is not conducting an orchestra."

"We have a crazy schedule in Boston—too much work and too many vacations. Each year I conduct 100 concerts. To relax I like to walk and ride horseback. I like to ride in the mountains especially. And I read a lot, mainly history."

DEFER BERLIN CRISIS VETERANS

(Mr. SCHWEIKER (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, Congress should act to defer any active duty callup of reservists and National Guardsmen who were mobilized during the 1961 Berlin crisis or whose enlist-

ments were extended for more than 90 days during the Berlin crisis. These personnel should not be recalled to active duty in any current callup unless absolutely vital to the national security.

I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that "the President should, insofar as it is consistent with the national defense and security, defer until last" the callup of personnel who were returned to active duty for more than 30 days during the Berlin crisis or whose enlistments were extended for more than 90 days.

As my colleagues know, there has been no notification of any impending callup by the President but there are indications such a mobilization is pending. I am not in a position to evaluate the need for a callup until further information is made available by Defense Secretary McNamara. Assuming, however, that the President intends such a callup, I urge that the Congress act promptly on this resolution.

Some 148,000 reservists and guardsmen were recalled to active duty in 1961 for the Berlin crisis. In addition, more than 300,000 Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine personnel then on active duty had their terms of service extended by order of the President. Many served up to 10 months of additional active duty time.

A joint resolution signed into law August 1, 1961, formed the basis of President Kennedy's Executive order of August 10, 1961, authorizing the mobilization of up to 250,000 ready reservists for not more than 12 months. The same order authorized the Secretary of Defense to involuntarily extend enlistments and periods of obligated service for up to 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the support of my colleagues for this resolution and urge speedy approval.

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. Brock) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KEITH'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LAWLESSNESS OF RACE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you appreciate the feeling some of us who represent the Southern States feel when we rise to discuss any measure dealing with so-called civil rights. We have taken the floor in the vast majority of cases in an effort to urge commonsense in the face of irrational, extremist proposals whose singlenmost feature is their premise that the end justifies any means necessary, including unconstitutional legislation, discriminatory legislation, and legislation that is admitted to be faulty and hasty in the cloakrooms but

July 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16773

dent of the university for resources, for winning the Time-Life Distinctive Merit Award for improvement in alumni publications; and for winning first place in a direct mail drive for annual giving funds to help support the university and an honorable mention for one mailing piece used in this campaign.

In addition, Mr. Gould accepted for Mr. Ford a special recognition citation for his story, "The Withering of the Caladiums," a takeoff on a Walter Lippmann column. Mr. Ford's story had been reprinted in the National Press Club Record, December 1964, and in the Tucson, Ariz., Star, December 20, 1964.

Two certificates of special merit were presented to Mr. Richard Berg, director of public relations, at the American College Public Relations Association meetings in Cincinnati, Ohio, for overall publications improvement and in recognition of a special publication used in student recruitment.

GW: The George Washington University magazine, is a quarterly magazine designed to share the ideas and findings of faculty, graduate students, and alumni on old and new issues. Its annual Federal Issue, published in late August, recognizes its many students and alumni engaged in public service. Sixteen reprints from last year's Federal Issue appeared in a variety of trade and professional publications, in newspapers, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For Mr. Dadd
PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY TOWARD VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, "there is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go." These words were written by an American soldier to his wife. Two days later he gave his life for his country. These are also the words that the American people are saying and believing.

President Johnson's policy toward Vietnam is now being accepted by his most unyielding critics. The reason for this change is that the opposition can give no alternative policy than the one being used now to solve the Vietnam war. They have cried for 5 months for us to withdraw from South Vietnam, but now they realize if we do, we will lose all of southeast Asia to the Communists.

Roscoe Drummond wrote in the Washington Post:

The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

I believe the Communists will soon learn that this country is behind the President, will not withdraw, will not grow tired, and will not be defeated.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have Roscoe Drummond's column of July 7, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 7, 1965]

DEBATE CONCLUDED: DEFENSE OF VIETNAM SUPPORTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The debate is over. The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count

on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

For a time it looked like touch and go and many thought that the President's public backing was crumbling. The professorial teach-ins crying, "Get out of Vietnam" were contagious. Poets writing L.B.J. about how wrong he was seemed to be getting a better hearing than Rusk and McNamara.

But it was the opposition to the defense of Vietnam that was crumbling, not the support. Although there has been no formal referendum, the national decision is amply clear. Here is the evidence:

Top Republican spokesmen—Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD, the minority leaders in Congress, who have given Mr. Johnson strong support over Vietnam from the beginning, have just renewed their bipartisan backing.

Democratic leaders in Congress—like Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT and FRANK CHURCH—who have been sharply critical of the President's course in Vietnam, are now agreeing that for the United States to withdraw or give up would be disastrous.

The public critics of the Government—like Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, the leading professional teach-in—have talked so much and said so little that the country could not fail to see that they had no constructive alternative.

This undermined their criticism so badly with the public that Professor Morgenthau had to shift his stance and say he was against withdrawal.

Some sincerely say, "Let's negotiate." The United States has offered unconditional discussions, the Communists have refused and you can't negotiate at an empty table.

Some sincerely say, "Quit escalating the war." The fact is that U.S. military power is being used with care and measure. It is the Vietcong who are raising the level of terror and escalating the fighting.

Some sincerely say, "The real struggle in Vietnam is economic, not military." It is both, and Vietnam cannot begin to make real economic progress until the aggression is ended and the fighting stopped. At which time, as the President has announced, the United States will provide general aid.

And what next? There is no certain answer. We don't know how long it will be before the aggressor has had enough. But there is no reason to think that the Vietcong are going to overrun South Vietnam if we are prepared to stay the course. I give you the words—and the faith—of Capt. James Spruill, U.S. Army, written to his wife in the United States a few days before he gave his life in Vietnam.

"I feel there is too much talk of despair. Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please do not let them, back where you are, sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty, and of victory—for we must and can win here.

"There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go."

Another American has said: "We will not withdraw. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated."

That was the President of the United States. It is evident by now that his goal is the goal of most Americans.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an outstanding tribute to Adlai Stevenson was made by Murray Kempton in the Washington Daily News July 17. I ask

unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG DISTANCE RUNNER

(By Murray Kempton)

We were all of us young, young and gay, and so for awhile was he. That was 13 years ago and it lasted only a few months. So the sad thoughts about Adlai Stevenson began a long way back. Today's are the saddest of all, but they are not sadder than so many of the others.

He died, of course, in a public place. So many times, when the worst thing had happened, he had to endure it in a public place. He seemed always lonely and never given the release of being alone.

Most of us saw him first in the convention which nominated him, with the band playing "Chicago, that toddling town," the wild, vulgar, tawdry, demented scene in which the Democrats are used to winding up their business. Yet even that night he quieted us and made us listen, for the quiet voice in the noisy room was the only one he trusted.

"Let's face it," he said that night. "Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains."

He went on from there to the only political campaign in the memory where to stand with a candidate was not for one moment to risk your pride in him.

He told the Polish-Americans in Hamtramck that he would not tell them that he could free Poland. He told the South in Richmond that he would carry out the civil rights planks in the Democratic platform. He talked to the American Legion about freedom of the mind. At the end, he looked back and said that he thought he had kept faith with himself and that he thanked all Americans for their infinite courtesy and their heartening friendliness.

We can remember that campaign now and see that it saved the Democrats, and that Adlai Stevenson was the only politician in his party who was the loser for it. For the quiet voice in the noisy room spoke to the young who had not before thought of politics with hope. Through 8 years, his memory and his presence sustained them; he gave them faith even though his own faith had been terribly damaged.

Yet the shadow of that election hung over him for the rest of his life, and he would never be gay again. The Republicans had asked us to trust a man; he had asked us instead to trust ourselves. And he had been not just defeated but overwhelmed. He ran again in 1956, but it could never again be the pure and simple faith the first time had been for him. He had been wounded in his dignity and the scar would always show. In 1960 the young came to Los Angeles from everywhere with the illusion that they need only cry out their dreams to capture the Democratic Convention for him once more; but it was too late; and the young were never to see him as we had in that far-off time when he was absolutely his own man, and honor and courage had no limits.

The remainder was the United Nations. There will be stories that he was unhappy at the end; there is already a story that he thought that what we had done in Santo Domingo was a fearful mistake. I do not know what use such revelations can have now; are we to think at the end of Adlai Stevenson as only lawyer for client?

There was talk that he might resign. His private answer was that he had been there when the United Nations began, that he had returned when it was healthy, and that he would not leave it now when it was sick.

That first campaign laid upon Adlai Stevenson a burden he could never put down. For all of us who remembered him from the

moment he captured us, he was not a public man but a personal possession, the embodiment of our own honor. He was the only public man of whom we demanded that, when he was ordered to lie, he must refuse.

But he did not belong to us; he belonged to his country. He would have stayed the course. "Patriotism is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion," he told the American Legion in 1952, "but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime." We have lost a long-distance runner.

WIRTZ AND NEW JERSEY SENATOR CHAMPION CAUSE OF THE MIGRANT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, of which I am a member, recently held 3 days of hearings on proposed legislation which would improve the wages and working conditions of our Nation's migratory farmworkers.

The July 11 St. Louis Post Dispatch, in an article entitled "Wirtz and New Jersey Senator Champion Cause of the Migrant," calls attention to the unfortunate conditions under which so many migratory workers live and labor and gives factual support of the need for remedial legislation. The St. Louis Post Dispatch story also acknowledges the efforts being made by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], Chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee in attempting to better the lives of our migratory farmworkers.

I believe the Senate should have the benefit of this article and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIRTZ AND NEW JERSEY SENATOR CHAMPION CAUSE OF THE MIGRANT

(By James C. Millstone)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Two powerful and determined men have pledged their help to the Nation's migrant farmworkers, whose plight has been labeled "a national disgrace."

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, have taken up the cause of what has been a friendless group of wanderers called variously "the poorest of the poor" and "the excluded Americans."

WILLIAMS has prodded Congress to action through his chairmanship of the 6-year-old Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. Wirtz has forcefully administered laws intended to help the migrants and has developed a program aimed at relieving the miserable conditions of their existence.

The two are working together to achieve further gains. At a hearing before WILLIAMS' subcommittee this week, both men placed great stress on the need to make the public more aware and more concerned about what Wirtz called "the iniquities and the inequities" of the life of the migrant.

Wirtz came armed with facts and figures, but none of his ammunition had the effect of a halting statement to the subcommittee by a migrant worker named Fidel Esquivel of San Antonio, Tex.

"I work on farm all my life," Esquivel said in Mexican-accented phrases. "Most time I am looking for job. Pay no good, maybe 75 cents an hour. We have no protection.

Sometimes me and my family (of five children) sleep on floor. In winter when no work, I stay in San Antonio, cut wood for ranches to make living until summer."

Esquivel is one of about 360,000 members of a leaderless army who take to the road each year to help harvest perishable fruits and vegetables. With their families, they number 2 million.

Some start in southern Florida and work north along the Atlantic coast into New England. Others go from southern Texas to the Rocky Mountains and then to the North-Central States. A third group streams into California and the Pacific Northwest.

Last year migrants worked in 47 of the 50 States. In 1963, the latest year for which figures are available, the average migrant found farmwork for 110 days and scrounged another 17 days of nonfarm work. His total earnings for the year were \$868, placing him at the lowest level of any group of workers in the Nation's economy.

But despite the rigors of his work, the ceaseless nature of his quest, and his abject poverty, the migrant worker lacks any of the protections afforded most working men and women.

Father Alfred Miller, a Catholic priest working with migrants in Erie, Mich., described the desperation of their plight in these words:

"Most are members of minority groups; poorly educated; outside the protections of minimum wage, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation; denied the use of health and educational facilities in many of the communities through which they pass; moving long distances to obtain short-term jobs.

"The migrant wanders loosely on the fringe of responsibility, one of the few American citizens without recourse."

A recent report by the WILLIAMS subcommittee said:

"The domestic agricultural migrant has been largely excluded from these social advances which the rest of the Nation takes for granted: the minimum wage, adequate child labor protection, unemployment insurance, full workmen's compensation and social security coverage, and federally protected rights to organize and bargain collectively.

"In addition, he is subject to special problems in the areas of housing and sanitation, transportation, education, health and child care, voting requirements, job placement, and job instability.

"Because of residence requirements, the migrant family frequently cannot even obtain public welfare assistance in times of need."

Testimony before the subcommittee developed information that some migrants in Texas work for as little as 45 cents an hour, that one-third of the migrants over 25 years old are functionally illiterate, that many of their children attend school only a few weeks a semester.

Over the years, the conditions of migrant farmworkers have drawn sympathetic and occasionally outraged attention, but even the wide influence of John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath" had little effect on permanently altering the misery of those lives.

The WILLIAMS subcommittee stepped in to fill that gap.

Backed by church, labor and welfare organizations, the subcommittee began to develop legislation that would help. WILLIAMS submitted bill after bill setting a minimum wage, regulating child employment, providing educational facilities for children of migrants, providing grants for housing, establishing health care centers and many others.

At first, Congress balked. The first success came in 1962 with passage of the Migrant Health Act providing Federal grants for

clinics to service migrant families. To date, 60 projects in 29 States and Puerto Rico have received grants.

WILLIAMS achieved his first real breakthrough last year when Congress took three significant actions:

(1) Four programs WILLIAMS had been pushing were included in the administration's Economic Opportunity Act to finance the war on poverty. The act authorizes grants for housing for migrants and their families, day care centers where children of migrants can receive good care while their parents are working, special educational facilities for children and adults and sanitation systems in their communities. The antipoverty program also incorporates the volunteers in service to America, some of whom are being trained to work among farm migrants.

To date, the OEO has awarded 52 grants totaling \$14,912,000 for programs to help migrants in 25 States. The agency hopes to spend twice as much for migrants in the new fiscal year.

(2) A law was passed requiring registration of farm labor contractors who organize and lead migrant crews from State to State. Until now, these men have operated without regulation and often have exploited and cheated the migrants.

Under the new law, they will have to register with the Federal Government and file reports of their activities.

(3) Public Law 78 which permitted thousands of Mexican braceros to harvest crops in this country since 1951, was terminated at the end of the year. The effects of that action are still being argued, but friends of the migrants insist that the step had to be taken before any permanent solution to the migrant problem could be developed.

In the late 1950's, as many as 400,000 braceros were admitted to this country annually. Last year the number was 178,000. Growers have said that the braceros were a necessity because the domestic labor market could not supply enough workers to do the kind of "stoop labor" necessary to harvest certain crops.

Wirtz has strongly supported WILLIAMS in the braceros fight. In a 4-day inspection trip of the California farming industry in March, Wirtz declared he would not authorize extension of the braceros program. He said farmers would have to obtain American workers by offering wages and working conditions competitive with other types of industry in the Nation.

The philosophy underlying Wirtz' policy, as he expressed it in a speech last week, is:

"The laws of economics, of supply and demand, do work in the agricultural industry just as in any other. Workers are available if the prices and conditions are right."

The braceros provided a cheap alternative to cost-conscious American growers, took jobs away from Americans and contributed to continuing low standards for American workers.

Given the inexhaustible supply of braceros and the lack of protection in wages and working conditions of American farm laborers, growers were able to depend more and more on the foreign field hands, who offered an added incentive by arriving without their families.

Meanwhile, unemployment grew among American farm laborers, striking hardest at the downtrodden migrants.

Testifying before the WILLIAMS subcommittee this week, Wirtz said the braceros cutoff has been successful, that American farm labor is available to meet the Nation's needs, that the crops are getting picked, and that consumer costs have been affected only minimally by the change.

The WILLIAMS-Wirtz team now is pushing for legislation that would establish a minimum wage for farmworkers, prohibit hiring